REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 752 AC 000 084

THE TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR THE LICENSING OF FAMILY HOMES IN CHILD WELFARE. FINAL REPORT.

BY- COSTIN, LELA B.

ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA, GRAD. SCH. OF SOCIAL WORK

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

PUB DATE 30 SEP 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$1.00 HC-$8.80 218P.

DESCRIPTORS- *NONPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, *JOB TRAINING, *WELFARE AGENCIES, *INSERVICE PROGRAMS, *INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, PROGRAM EVALUATION, PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, RATING SCALES, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CHILD WELFARE, SUPERVISORY TRAINING, CERTIFICATION,

A THREE-YEAR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO TRAIN NONPROFESSIONALS FOR LICENSING DAY CARE AND FOSTER HOMES WAS A COOPERATIVE VENTURE BETWEEN A SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND TEN STATE DIVISIONS OF CHILD WELFARE, STIMULATED BY CONCERN ABOUT MANPOWER SHORTAGES AND THE NEED FOR NEW APPROACHES TO TRAINING NONPROFESSIONALS IN SOCIAL WORK POSITIONS. FOLLOWING ANALYSIS OF THE FUNCTION OF LICENSING, DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS, AND SETTING STANDARDS OF COMPETENCE, THERE WERE THREE TRAINING DEMONSTRATIONS INVOLVING 41 LICENSING TRAINEES--(1) A COURSE CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES AND ON THE PREMISES OF A GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, COMBINED WITH ON THE JOB TRAINING, (2) AN AGENCY INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM, AND (3) A COURSE GIVEN BY THE GRADUATE SCHOOL TO TRAIN CHILD WELFARE AGENCY SUPERVISORS TO TRAIN NONPROFESSIONAL WORKERS. TRAINEE PERFORMANCE ON THE JOB WAS EVALUATED THROUGH A SUPERVISORY RATING SCALE. THE TRAINEES PERFORMED MOST TASKS SATISFACTORILY, BUT PERFORMED POORLY IN CASE RECORDING, USE OF AUTHORITY IN UNSATISFACTORY SITUATIONS, SUPERVISION-CONSULTATION TO A LICENSEE, AND ADEQUATE STUDY AT A TIME OF RELICENSING. NO DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND WHEN TRAINEE PERFORMANCE WAS COMPARED FOR EACH OF THE TRAINING GROUPS, OR WHEN TRAINEES WERE REGROUPED ACCORDING TO AGE, LEVEL OF EDUCATION, OR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN SOCIAL WORK. (AJ)

AC000 084
I
7

F131

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED017752

THE TRAINING OF PERSONNEL
FOR THE LICENSING OF FAMILY HOMES
IN CHILD WELFARE

A Final Report

to

Children's Bureau
Welfare Administration
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Grant D-52 (R) (C2)

Prepared by

Lela B. Costin

The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work
University of Illinois

Project Co-Directors:
Lela B. Costin and Jennette R. Gruener

In collaboration with
Ellen Handler, Research Associate
Mildred S. Johnson, Supervisor of Training

Urbana, Illinois
September 30, 1965

SEP 20 '66

THE TRAINING OF PERSONNEL
FOR THE LICENSING OF FAMILY HOMES
IN CHILD WELFARE

A Final Report

to

Children's Bureau,
Welfare Administration
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Grant D-52 (R) (C2)

Prepared by

Lela B. Costin

The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work
University of Illinois

Project Co-Directors:
Lela B. Costin and Jennette R. Gruener

In collaboration with
Ellen Handler, Research Associate
Mildred S. Johnson, Supervisor of Training

Urbana, Illinois
September 30, 1965

PREFACE

This volume is a final report of a demonstration officially entitled "Training the Nonprofessional Person for Licensing of Independent Day Care and Full-time Foster Homes." The project was carried out by staff members of the Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois, in cooperation with public child welfare divisions in ten states. It was supported in part by a demonstration grant from the Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. The investigation began June 1, 1962, and was concluded on September 30, 1965.

Four partial reports were submitted previously, as follows: "Progress Report, December 15, 1962"; "Report of a Pilot Project, November, 1963"; "Progress Report, December 15, 1963"; and "Progress Report, December 1, 1964."

This final report attempts to present the project as a whole--its aims, methods, and outcomes--with particular attention to the evaluative research which was undertaken in relation to the training demonstrations.

The project staff wishes to acknowledge its indebtedness to the many persons and agencies who assisted in various ways to bring the project to a successful conclusion.

The following state agencies participated in the demonstrations: The Illinois State Department of Children and Family Services; The Indiana Department of Public Welfare; The Iowa Department of Social Welfare; The

Ohio Department of Public Welfare; The Texas Department of Public Welfare; The Minnesota Department of Public Welfare; The Missouri Department of Public Health and Welfare; The Nebraska Department of Public Welfare; The New York State Department of Social Welfare; The Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. Special thanks go to numerous staff members of these agencies who helped to make the manifestations of cooperation concrete and productive.

Two panels of social workers from various states gave of their time and energy beyond their usual work assignments in order to identify the tasks of licensing and assess the relative importance of these tasks.

Staff persons of the Children's Bureau, and particularly Helen Witmer, Director, and Charles P. Gershenson, Associate Director of the Division of Research, consulted helpfully with us at various stages of the investigation. Appreciation is also expressed to Annie Lee Sandusky who gave encouraging support in the early development of the project.

The following persons served as consultants to the investigation at various stages: Professors Frank Costin and Ledyard Tucker of the Psychology Department, University of Illinois; Professor Norris E. Class, School of Social Work, University of Southern California; and Professor Edwin J. Thomas, School of Social Work, University of Michigan.

Professor Mark P. Hale, Director of the Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois, and faculty members of the School, provided sustaining support to this project. In addition, Ellen Handler served as Research Associate and Mildred S. Johnson as Supervisor of Training.

Professor Jennette R. Gruener was Project Director during the first year of the investigation; Professors Gruener and Lela B. Costin were co-directors during the second year. In the third year, Lela B. Costin directed the project and prepared the final report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

LIST OF TABLES. vii

Chapter

I. BACKGROUND OF PROJECT 1

II. MAJOR PRE-DEMONSTRATION OPERATIONS. 9

The Identification of Licensing Tasks
A Standard of Competence
Development of Curriculum and Teaching Materials
A Pilot Demonstration

III. THREE DEMONSTRATIONS. 36

Training Method I
Training Method II
Training Method III

IV. EVALUATION. 61

The Nature of the Groups to be Trained
Did the Trainees Achieve Knowledge of the Content Taught?
What Was the Trainees' Level of Competence?
Additional Aspects of Trainee Performance
A Comparison of Training Demonstrations
How Did the Participants Regard the Demonstrations?

V. OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 130

VI. AGENCY-SCHOOL RELATIONSHIPS 135

APPENDIX I. 151

APPENDIX II 155

TABLES. 161

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table — Page

16. Mean Scores of Trainees on Two Experimental Interviews: Training Method I. 202

17. Percentage Agreement of Two Judges on Rating Scale for 19 Live Initial Interviews. 203

18. Trainee Scores on Initial Interviews: Training Method III. 204

19. Record Rating Scale: Percentage Agreement Between Two Independent Judges on 98 Records. 205

20. Results from the Evaluation of Case Records: Achievement of Trainee Groups on the Various Categories of Record Content. 206

21. Record Rating Scale: Achievement of Trainee Groups on Various Items of Record Content. 208

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
1. Rating of Tasks in the Licensing of Independent Family Homes. 161

2. Supervisory Rating Scale: Standard Scores and Weights from Factor Analysis of Experts' Ratings. 164

3. Record Rating Scale: Standard Scores and Weights from Factor Analysis of Experts' Ratings. 167

4. Principal Axes Factor Matrix. 168

5. Classification of Tasks in the Licensing of Family Homes. 169

6. *Sample Computations for Evaluating Worker* Performance 175

7. Characteristics of Trainees 180

8. Parental Attitude Research Instrument: A Comparison of Scores of Three Groups of Students. 181

9. Content Examination: Summary of Results. 182

10. Summary of Results of Supervisory Rating Scale: Achievement of Trainee Groups on the Various Categories of Central and Peripheral Tasks. 183

11. Supervisory Rating Scale: Ratings of Trainee Groups on Central Tasks within Categories 184

12. Supervisory Rating Scale: Ratings of Trainee Groups on Peripheral Tasks within Categories. 190

13. Supervisors' List of Tasks With Which Trainees Needed Most Help. 199

14. Situational Test: Achievement of Trainee Groups. 200

15. Experimental Interview: Percentage Agreement Between Raters on Two Sets of Eight Interviews. 201

I. BACKGROUND OF PROJECT

The training demonstrations herein reported involved a three-year cooperative venture in staff development between a school of social work and ten state divisions of child welfare. The project has been based on the premises that it is imperative that there be systematic investigation of the tasks in child welfare which the nonprofessional person can do effectively, that graduate schools of social work are in a favorable position to give leadership in this investigation, and that the licensing function can be used to raise the level of care for large numbers of children.[1]

Aims of the project: The project had one central purpose: to demonstrate that the nonprofessional staff person can adequately perform the tasks involved in the licensing of family homes. This central purpose included these specific aims: (1) to identify the tasks of a worker who carries out the licensing of family homes, and the knowledge and skills needed to perform these tasks; (2) to ascertain the relative importance of these tasks in licensing; (3) to develop a curriculum and set of teaching materials which will constitute an effective course content for teaching the licensing of family homes; (4) to establish a level of competence against which a licensing worker's performance can be measured; (5) to demonstrate and evaluate three different ways of training nonprofessional persons for the tasks of licensing; and (6) to determine, through evaluation of on-the-job performance, those tasks which the nonprofessional worker trained in one of the three demonstrations performed successfully, those tasks which presented difficulty, and some of the factors involved in this difficulty.

---

[1] A description of the project and its early progress has been published. See Lela B. Costin and Jennette R. Gruener, "A Project for Training Personnel in Child Welfare," Child Welfare, XLIII, No. 4 (April, 1964), pp. 175-181.

Three ways of training workers which have been tried out are: (1) a course for nonprofessional trainees conducted under the auspices of and on the premises of a graduate school of social work; (2) an agency in-service training program for nonprofessional trainees, under agency auspices, using project teaching materials and project staff consultation; and (3) a course for child welfare supervisors given by the graduate school, each of these supervisors then training at least one nonprofessional worker under the auspices of his own agency.[2]

Necessity for systematic investigation: For a long time there has been much concern over the shortage of professionally educated workers in social welfare positions. Social workers have acknowledged that shortages of social workers exist in every area of social work practice.[3] Significantly, there is evidence that the social work profession is beginning to assume considerable responsibility for the degree of preparedness that the nonprofessional worker presents in his social welfare position. Reports indicating this growing interest on the part of social workers can be found in the literature.[4] The interest is also reflected in the intensified efforts on the part of public welfare agencies to develop and carry out better planned and more consistent programs of in-service training for the increasing numbers of untrained workers being added to their staffs. A recent recognition of the profession's increasing concern about teaching, use, and deployment of social welfare personnel can be seen in the institute for "Research on Social Welfare Manpower," sponsored in 1964 by the NASW Council for Social Work Research. The announcement of the institute states, "While the shortage of personnel is a critical problem, no less critical is the paucity of systematic studies on how best to use existing personnel."[5]

---

[2] The term "nonprofessional" worker is defined as a person without graduate education in social work. This definition is used with acknowledgement that no satisfactory term has been agreed upon by the social work profession to apply to the person who fills a social welfare position but does not have graduate social work education. Nonprofessional, pre-professional, sub-professional, untrained, agency trained, social work aide -- all are used. Therefore, somewhat arbitrarily, the term "nonprofessional" is used for purposes of this project.

---

[3] Employment Outlook for Social Workers. Occupational Outlook Report Series. Reprint from the 1963-64 Occupational Outlook Handbook. Bulletin No. 1375-43, United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.

[4] Laura Epstein, "Differential Use of Staff: A Method to Expand Social Services," Social Work, VII, No. 4 (1962), pp. 66-72; Margaret M. Heyman, "A Study of Effective Utilization of Social Workers in a Hospital Setting," Social Work, VI, No. 2 (1961), pp. 36-43; Fergus Thomas Monahan, A Study of Nonprofessional Personnel in Social Work -- The Army Social Work Specialist (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of American Press, 1960); National Association of Social Workers, Inc., Utilization of Personnel in Social Work: Those With Full Professional Education and Those Without. Final Report, Subcommittee on Utilization of Personnel, February, 1962; Edwin J. Thomas and Donna L. McLeod, In-service Training and Reduced Workloads (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960); Verne Weed and William H. Denham, "Toward More Effective Use of the Nonprofessional Worker: A Recent Experiment," Social Work, VI, No. 4 (1961), pp. 29-36.

Although child welfare agency administrators must, of course, meet the daily demands for services, even if this means extensive use of workers without graduate social work education, it is also essential that their effort be accompanied by systematic investigations as to the proper use of these persons. . For how else, in view of the shortages of professional workers, are we to use professional staff as fruitfully as possible? Not to carry out this kind of investigation is, in a sense, a denial of the complexity of child welfare functions, and tends to negate the importance of professional education for social work.

The role of a graduate school: The underlying rationale for this project can be discussed with attention to two questions: What is the responsibility of a graduate school of social work for projects such as this one? And, why was the licensing function chosen as the subject for the demonstrations?

The primary function of graduate schools of social work is, and indeed should be, to prepare professional social workers. There is an increasing need, however, for thinking about what the schools of social work can contribute to the training of nonprofessional persons for certain aspects of social work activity.

---

[5] "Research on Social Welfare Manpower," _NASW News_, VII, No. 4 (1963).

The faculty of The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work has given consideration to the crucial manpower problem in public welfare. While continuing to see its major function to be graduate education for persons in the social work profession, the School has, as a matter of policy, accepted responsibility for giving continuing attention to the difficult problems in the use of nonprofessional personnel in social work, and for providing leadership, whenever possible, in new approaches to training and use of nonprofessional staff. It is believed that a project, such as the one being reported, can assist the states in meeting their appropriate responsibility for sound in-service training programs and at the same time, inject into the training some of the values and scholarship attached to education in a graduate school of social work.

Why the licensing function?: The licensing function has been singled out for study because of the renewed importance today of licensing in the network of child welfare services. Licensing of independent family homes is high among the pressing tasks in child welfare which need to be fulfilled. Licensing is of basic importance as a means of giving some protection to the increasing number of children who have to live away from their own homes, either part of the day or full-time. Licensing of family homes, when performed with conviction and skill, has within it a "dynamic for change" and is generally accepted as an effective method of giving at least minimal protection to children needing care outside their own homes.[6]

The importance of licensing as a means of giving protection to large numbers of children becomes greatly heightened today as states have continued difficulties in attempting to extend comprehensive child welfare services to all children and families who need them. The expected increase[7] in the numbers of women entering the labor force foreshadows a rapidly increasing need for licensed day care facilities for the children of these working mothers. In addition, intensive emphasis in some states upon plans for rehabilitation and training for employment of AFDC mothers may further increase the demand for licensed day care homes. No reliable estimate is available of the number of children being cared for full-time in foster family homes not under agency auspices. The "independent"[8] situations are in urgent need of identification and study to discover what social services are needed and might be offered. Locating and licensing these homes, when standards are met, is a first step.

---

[6] Gertrude Binder and Norris E. Class, "Regulatory Standards for Welfare Services," Social Casework, XXXVIII (1957), pp. 468-473, "The Nature of Welfare Licensing Laws," Social Casework, XXXIX (1958), pp. 267-273, and "Maintenance of Regulatory Standards for Welfare Service," Social Casework, XXXIX (1958), pp. 342-349; Norris E. Class, "Foster Child Care Licensing as a Public Welfare Responsibility," Public Welfare, XX (1962), pp. 217-220, 236-237; Norris E. Class and Gertrude Binder, "Foster Care Licensing in Public Welfare," Children, VIII (1961), pp. 28-31; and Edna Hughes, Dwight H. Ferguson, and Martin Gula, Licensing: A Dynamic for Change (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1962).

[7] Gertrude L. Hoffman, Day Care Services: Form and Substance (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1961).

Another reason for the selection of the licensing of family homes as a subject for study, is the theoretical rationale for expecting that the college graduate might be trained to perform these tasks reasonably well: Richan's theory[9] that jobs which can safely be left to the nonprofessional are those in which the client is less vulnerable and the worker has less autonomy. Licensing of family homes would appear to offer a sound area for training and employing nonprofessional workers. The worker-client contact, in this instance, is not a sustaining casework relationship. And, even though the licensing worker is expected to be perceptive, understanding, and supportive, the help he gives to foster mothers in difficult situations does not involve treatment; it is, rather, of a consultative or teaching nature. Consequently, client vulnerability is low. In addition, the considered judgments of the workers are made on the basis of application of agency policy with support of agency requirements and specifications.

---

[8] For purposes of this project, "independent" home means one that is selected for the full-time or part-time care of children by parents or other persons responsible for a child, independently of a licensed child welfare agency. The only controls, therefore, are those inherent in the work of the agency representative who studies the home in order to determine whether a license can be issued. The home, upon licensing, comes under the supervision of the licensing agency for purposes of seeing that standards continue to be met. Consultative help is also given, when indicated, in an effort to improve or maintain better standards of care for children. The person licensed, however, continues her independent relationship with the person who arranged for the care of a particular child.

[9] Willard C. Richan, "A Theoretical Scheme for Determining Roles of Professional and Nonprofessional Personnel," Social Work, VI, No. 4 (1961), pp. 22-28.

The foregoing does not mean, however, that the licensing function is a mechanical application of rules and regulations. A dynamic use of the licensing requirements involves skill in observation and interviewing, the use of individual judgment, and an ability to arrive at a decision as to whether the license should be issued, this decision being based on careful study and presentation of evidence. But, because this procedure is carried out in a framework of law, agency policy, written "standards," and shared responsibility, worker autonomy is low.

Summary: The major considerations which gave rise to the project being reported are these: the social work profession is faced with urgent problems in relation to insufficient numbers of staff who have graduate education in social work; there is a critical need for systematic study of how best to use existing personnel; graduate schools of social work are in a favorable position to give leadership in these investigations; the licensing of family homes is an essential child welfare function and one where there is a rationale for expecting that the person without graduate social work education can be trained to perform these tasks adequately.

II. MAJOR PRE-DEMONSTRATION OPERATIONS

Before effective demonstrations of training can be conducted and evaluated, considerable preparation is necessary. Some of the planning activities which were carried out appear to have usefulness beyond that of getting ready for these particular demonstrations. These operations will be discussed below.

The Identification of Licensing Tasks

A base for training course content: An analysis of the content of the licensing function in child welfare was the first step. This analysis began with a tentative enumeration by project staff and representatives of a public child welfare agency of the tasks involved in the licensing of family homes. This provided a basis for identifying the knowledge that would be needed by the trainees to perform these tasks and the skills that would have to be taught either in the training course or on the job. This material provided the foundation for the first draft of a course syllabus.

The next step was to specify these tasks more clearly and to discover the extent to which social workers agreed on the importance of these tasks. This seemed an important step if the training course was to be based on what social workers expected the licensing worker to be able to do.

Determination of the relative importance of the tasks: A rating scale was developed on which social workers who had experience in licensing could be asked to indicate the relative importance of various tasks in fulfilling the licensing responsibility. Thirty-four major tasks were listed. Respondents were expected to indicate their opinion, on each task described, as "very important," "important," or "relatively unimportant." Space was also provided to indicate if the specific task was an inappropriate one according to practice, or to write in additional appropriate tasks.[1]

Thirty-six states were currently listed[2] as having mandatory licensing responsibility for day care family homes and centers. State supervisory licensing staff persons from these states were asked to submit names of licensing supervisors and workers who could appropriately respond to a request to rate the importance of licensing tasks. Rating scales were then sent to 110 persons in 26 states and 84 per cent were returned completed. These respondents were on the whole a highly experienced group of persons and, in about an even ratio, occupied positions of state child welfare staff, regional or field staff, county supervisors, caseworkers and/or licensing workers.

---

[1] A copy of the Rating Scale is found in Appendix A, (separate volume from this report) pp. 12a-12e. Examples of tasks listed on the scale are: "Interpret regulations and procedures of licensing to persons wishing to make application for a license"; "Inspect home of applicant to see that standards of home conform to state requirements"; "Make a recommendation concerning approval or rejection for licensing."

[2] Seth Low, Licensed Day Care Facilities for Children (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Children's Bureau, 1962), p. 7.

Results: An analysis of the ratings showed that, while all of the tasks were considered important to some extent, highest ratings were assigned to tasks contained in (1) the application phase of the licensing process; (2) the study of the applicant's home to determine if standards are met; and (3) making a decision and recommendation as to whether a license should be issued. Lowest ratings were assigned to (1) community organization tasks of licensing; (2) interviewing references; (3) giving consultation to the licensee around problems of child care; and (4) work with natural parents of the child in independent care, as well as a few tasks relating to necessary office procedures.[3]

These opinions of social workers, knowledgeable about licensing, provided a basis for revision and extension of curriculum materials and for the construction of various tests to measure a trainee's performance of the tasks which had been identified.

A Standard of Competence

The next step was to obtain a representative and objective determination of the level of competence required for the tasks of licensing. The project staff considered an attempt to establish empirical norms by seeking a large control group from randomly selected family home licensing workers in various public welfare settings. This would have necessitated the cooperation of large numbers of such workers who might be willing, as well as able, to give time to completing the various tests, recorded interviews, and case records for analysis. A request with these kinds of commitments would require the interest and support of a substantial number of administrative and supervisory persons in the various work settings where there are many conflicting and pressing demands for the use of agency personnel time and energy. The difficulties are formidable in securing a stable control group for the life of a demonstration project in public welfare settings. Even if these arrangements were successfully completed, the results would have provided norms of "what exists" in licensing practice without a determination of the particular level of competence displayed. Furthermore, with the general disparity and unevenness which exists in licensing practice,[4] a determination of a level of competence from this kind of norm would be particularly unstable.

---

[3] See Table 1, p. 161.

Alternatives to the use of a control group of licensing workers were considered. One approach would be to try to find agreement among social workers as to what kind of performance would constitute an ideal level of licensing practice. This might be relatively easy to attain since most persons usually find it less difficult to agree on what is ideal practice or distant goals than to evaluate and identify an actual level of practice. However, knowing what was agreed upon as an "ideal" standard would not answer the question as to whether the trainees performed the particular tasks under study "satisfactorily," even though they might fall short of ideal practice.

---

[4] Child Welfare League of America, Inc., Day Care Licensing Report, Preliminary Report, February 1964 (Mimeo).

A different approach in determining the standard of competence was agreed upon. This was to consider the imperative tasks implied by a public program, i.e., to focus upon the requirements which an agency should have if its responsibility for a given function was to be met adequately, although minimally. An individual's performance that meets minimal agency responsibility to persons directly served and to the supporting public was the basic criterion for determining the level of competence that the project staff sought to identify. As a result, the amount of training or experience of a worker was not considered in calculating what constituted competence. Instead, a judgment of competence was based directly on the requirements of the task at hand, and the degree to which a worker's performance of the task allowed minimal agency responsibility to be met. The comparative base, therefore, became an absolute one, in that performance below that level would be considered unsatisfactory, whether it was performed by a nonprofessional or a professional worker, or an experienced or an inexperienced worker.

Having identified the standard of competence sought, the next step was to set the required level of performance for each test which had been developed. The use of opinions from a panel of experts provided the data for setting the competence level on three of our evaluation procedures: the Supervisory Rating Scale, the Record Rating Scale, and the Situational Test. Staff consensus, with the experts' body of opinion as a guideline, was used to set the competence level on the evaluation of initial interviews and of some additional case record material.

The procedures used for each of these tests is described elsewhere.[5] The use of experts' opinions in setting the standard of competence for the Supervisory Rating Scale and the Record Rating Scale is discussed in some detail below for these reasons: (1) it added confirmation to the findings about the relative importance of the identified tasks and considerably extended the analysis of the content of the licensing function; (2) it provided a firm guideline for project staff who were required to make judgments in relation to a level of minimal competence for other tests; and (3) it is a method which appears to offer a series of useful alternatives for judging performance of social workers, and as such is a promising area for further investigation.

Use of panel of experts: A panel of expert judges was asked to set a level of competence which would constitute the point at which agency responsibility to the persons directly served and to supporting public would be met on an acceptable, although minimal, basis. A panel of 21 judges was formed to define a minimally adequate level of competence in relation to the identified tasks in the licensing of family homes.

The expert judges were persons especially interested, knowledgeable, or experienced in the area of licensing of family homes, and who were currently engaged in work which involved to some extent the problems which enter into licensing practice and the relationship of these problems to the use of scarce social work manpower. Requests were sent to 25 such social workers (21 of whom accepted and completed the assignment). These experts were employed in 16 states in one of the following positions: state child welfare administrator, staff development director, day care consultant, state or regional supervisor of child welfare services or of licensing services.[6]

---

[5] See Appendix A for copies of all evaluation instruments and scoring systems.

Some instruction was supplied the experts in an effort to clarify the concept of competence as it was defined for this project and to help panel members work through the kinds of difficulties which consideration of this concept poses. For example, experts were reminded that social workers are apt to think in terms of what standard they would like to see met -- an image of "good" practice that approaches the ideal, or they may tend to identify a level of competence in concrete terms, as that level of performance attained by workers they had known or supervised and whose work they considered satisfactory, but without regard to whether the level of competence displayed was just at, or above the level which would meet agency responsibility minimally. Other pitfalls for the theoretical considerations necessary to this problem were pointed out, e.g., setting the standard too low on the basis that in practice such performance is sometimes accepted, but which in reality may not meet agency responsibility even minimally; or focusing on the difficulty of the task rather than on the relevance of the task for meeting agency responsibility, which might lead the expert to try to compensate for the difficulty of the task under study by setting the level lower than would actually meet agency responsibility.

---

[6] The request made of the panel of experts was a very demanding one. It was gratifying to see the serious effort which they put into this cooperative venture, and the enthusiasm they had for helping to develop the standard, even though most of them spent long hours at the assignment outside their regular working hours.

Each expert was sent a copy of a Supervisory Rating Scale and a Record Rating Scale[7] -- the same scales which were later to be used by persons other than the experts in rating the work of trainees participating in one of three demonstrations of training. A description of these two scales follows.

Supervisory Rating Scale: The Supervisory Rating Scale was based on the identification of tasks completed during the early stages of the project. These tasks were divided into their constituent parts and a selection made of those tasks believed to be most accessible to supervisory evaluation.

Each of the 93 items in the Rating Scale defined a task and implied a certain degree of adequacy in performance. Examples of items follow:

"Is the trainee able to:

1. involve the applicant as much as possible in the planning process?

---

[7] See Appendix A, pp. 62-80 and 83-99.

2. use vocabulary that can be readily understood by the applicant?
3. work cooperatively with colleagues?
4. show in carrying out his tasks that he regards the licensing procedure as worthwhile?
5. give information concerning the requirements to be met in obtaining a license?
6. gather a sufficient amount of pertinent data concerning the psychological resources of a home?
7. apply the licensing standards consistently in an evaluation of a home?
8. carry out referrals to other agencies or community resources?
9. arrive at a thoroughly considered recommendation regarding licensability of a home?
10. assess the plausibility of a complaint against a licensee?
11. organize material to be covered in a case record according to the routine of the agency?
12. accept supervision when it is offered?"

The level of acceptable competence was determined by the panel of expert judges using the following procedure: the entire scale of 93 items was sent to each expert. Instructions were given to consider each item separately and then to place a check on a continuum provided for that item at the point which, in the expert's opinion, must be attained by any given trainee if agency responsibility was to be met minimally. The continuum was as follows:[8]

Never Sometimes Most of the time Almost Always Always

---

[8] *Almost Always* represents about three-fourths of the instances in which the task was performed; *Most of the time* represents about one-half of the instances; and *Sometimes*, about one-fourth. Ratings were given numerical scores as follows: *Never*, 0; *Sometimes*, 1; *Most of the time*, 2; *Almost Always*, 3; and *Always*, 4.

Record Rating Scale: This scale which experts dealt with was concerned with content of a record and was evolved from theoretical considerations of what could, appropriately, be included in a licensing study.

The scale contains 39 items, each related to an area of information appropriate to a family home licensing study record. Examples of these items follow:

1. Source of referral: how applicant learned of licensing and of the agency.
2. Applicant's motivation for wanting to give a child care service: stated reasons as well as other motivating factors not necessarily recognized by the applicant.
3. Applicant's expectations of child's natural parents: days and hours children will be cared for by applicant; fees; division of responsibility for total child care between applicant and natural parents.
4. Applicant's plan for daily play activity, including active and quiet play, outdoors and indoors.
5. Description of foster mother's current functioning in relation to attitude towards and methods of handling children, age, health, interests.
6. Overall description of housing in terms of: size and condition of the home; safety, sanitation, ventilation, water supply, pets, food facilities, etc.
7. Overall evaluation of applicant's home in relation to meeting of minimum standards.

The level of acceptable competence was determined by the experts as follows: each expert was sent a set of definitions of the 39 items as well as a description of five discrete levels of recording performance. These levels were as follows:

0 -- This area of information not mentioned in the record even though relevant.
1 -- This area of information covered by a brief, general, very minimal statement.
2 -- Information given is more than absolutely minimal but leaves important questions unanswered.
3 -- This area of information is discussed quite fully with considerable amplification and illustration.
4 -- Description in this area approaches maximum effectiveness with full discussion of all pertinent factors.

Anchoring illustrations to clarify the levels further were also supplied the expert. He then was asked to consider independently each of the 39 items and to determine first, whether this item needed to be included in any given licensing study record in order for the agency to meet its responsibility minimally. If the item was not considered relevant for meeting agency responsibility minimally, and therefore could be omitted from the record, that item should be checked as 0. If it needed to be included, the expert was asked to determine if the 1 level was sufficient in this area for a minimally adequate record. If so, he was to check at the 1 level. If not, he was to consider the next highest level and so forth, from the lowest to the highest level, until he had determined a level for each of the 39 items which, in his opinion, would meet agency responsibility on a minimally adequate basis.

Analysis of experts' responses: The data drawn from the panel of experts in relation to the Record Rating Scale and the Supervisory Rating Scale has been subjected to a factor analysis to test for systematic differences or patterns in the value opinions expressed by the experts.[9]

A more usual approach than factor analysis in this situation would have been to determine the expert group average for each item on the two scales and then to generalize findings to this "average person" in the group, i.e., by finding the differences between the "average expert" score and the performance score of the trainee. This method could easily have led to false interpretations, however, since the results for the "average expert" may conceal considerable variation or disagreement among the experts. Furthermore, with the unevenness in the development and application of licensing theory, it seemed especially important to allow for the varieties of individual perception -- more so than might be necessary for a panel of experts registering opinion about an area of practice where there is less disparity.

---

[9] Factor analysis is essentially a method which constructs statistically from a host of variables the important wholes which need to be taken into account when seeking laws of interaction. It begins with the hypothesis that some structure exists to be discovered; it then proceeds to group the numerous possible variables in the fewest possible single wholes or wholistic influences. In doing this, it not only separates out the distinct factors at work among the variables, but it also groups the variables together in ways which permit one to synthesize and name entities.

Another limitation in simply obtaining an average of the various experts' ratings became apparent when an overall standard score for minimally adequate competence was sought. Simply adding together the averages of the experts' ratings for each item implied an underlying assumption that all of the items of the scales were equally important as a measure of the extent to which agency responsibility had been met. The project staff agreed that this was not so.

Therefore, a factor analytic technique developed by Tucker[10] was employed. This procedure has the following advantages: (1) it allows for basic differences in the value patterns of experts; (2) it shows the consistent responses of an individual expert or group of experts; (3) it clarifies the nature of the differences in value patterns; and (4) it reflects the relative importance attached to the various tasks.[11]

---

[10] Ledyard Tucker, Factor Analysis of Relevance Judgments: An Approach to Content Validity, Proceedings of 1961 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, Educational Testing Service, Princeton Publications, 1962.

Ledyard Tucker and William E. Coffman, "A Factor Analytic Study of Judged Relevance of Test Items," Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October, 1959 (RM-59-11).

Ledyard Tucker and Samuel Messick, "An Individual Differences Model for Multidimensional Scaling," Psychonometrica, The Psychonometric Society, Vol. 28, No. 4 (December, 1963).

Findings: The results of the analysis showed that the experts' ratings fell into two major dimensions -- Factors I and II -- reflecting two main value patterns. Factor I reflected a single set of values and one on which there was high agreement among the experts, as was apparent from the small range of the loadings[12] for this factor (.68 to 1.25). In contrast, Factor II showed divided agreement among the experts and represented two sets of values, one defined by the experts who were at the upper end of the dimensions -- Factor II, position a -- and the other defined by the experts who were at the lower end of the dimension -- Factor II, position b.[13]

---

[11] Tucker's technique is an adaptation of Principle Axes Factor Analysis which can be used to determine the underlying clusters or dimensions of a large group of variables, in this case of judges' ratings on the items of the Supervisory and Record Rating Scales. The dimensions which emerge from the analysis represent different value patterns held in common by a group of experts. Standard scores and corresponding weights are derived from these dimensions. (See Tables 2 and 3, pp. 164 and 167) The standard scores represent the rating that would be given to each item by an abstracted "ideal" judge who typifies the value patterns of the group of judges who define a particular dimension. Weights are used to reflect the relative importance attached to the various items. This method differs from the more usual Principle Axes Factor Analysis in two important respects. First, the variables studied are the 21 judges (as their value patterns are reflected in their ratings) rather than performance scores on tests which are the usual variables. Second, the method was applied to a matrix of mean squares and mean cross products rather than to the usual covariance of intercorrelation matrix. The Supervisory Rating Scale and the Record Rating Scale are treated together in the factor analysis even though one scale rates performance on a frequency continuum and the other on descriptive performance levels. However, they have the same underlying purpose -- to measure the quality of performance, and the steps on each have the same basic equivalence. For example, an 0 on the Record Rating Scale indicates that an area of information was not mentioned even though relevant, and an 0 on the Supervisory Rating Scale indicates that the task was never performed in the manner specified. Therefore, an expert's rating on any item of either scale reflects the level of performance which represents minimally adequate competence as well as the importance which was attached to that particular item for meeting agency responsibility.

FACTOR I appeared to represent an emphasis on the tasks which social workers had rated as of highest importance in the identification of tasks which took place in the early stages of the project. Items which experts gave the highest ratings (>2.5) can be generally described as tasks requiring concrete skills, as often arose out of directly observable situations usually found in the application of the tangible standards; or tasks relating to dealings with "primary" persons, i.e., applicants for a license, colleagues in the agency setting, or collateral personnel (such as fire marshals, health department personnel, zoning commissioners, all of whom play a direct and tangible role in determing eligibility for child care license). Items which illustrate these tasks follow:

"Is the trainee able to:

1. give information concerning procedure to be followed to obtain a license?

---

[12] "Loading" for a particular factor refers to the relationship between the variable (the expert's ratings) and the factor. The greater the distance of the loading from 0, the more that expert's rating has contributed to the importance of the factor.

[13] See Table 4, p. 168 for the location of experts on the two factors.

2. communicate with the applicant by using vocabulary that can be readily understood?
3. gather a sufficient amount of pertinent data concerning the physical resources of a home?
4. work cooperatively with collateral personnel?
5. accept supervision when it is needed?"

In contrast, items which received generally lower ratings on Factor I (< 2.5), can be described as tasks requiring somewhat more abstract skills, often arising out of psychological situations as are found in the application of intangible standards; or tasks relating to dealings with "secondary" persons, i.e., spouses and children of applicants, references (friends), others in the applicant's household (boarders, relatives), or natural parents of children in independent family care. Examples follow:

"Is the trainee able to:

1. indicate thorough knowledge of intangible standards as related to psychological requirements?
2. establish constructive relationships by accepting the other person's feelings?
3. gather sufficient pertinent data concerning the psychological resources of a home?
4. give consultative help to licensee to help raise the level of child care being offered in the home?
5. display awareness of the needs of natural parents of children in independent foster care?"

Further examination of the items which received high and low ratings on Factor I showed that those with high ratings were most usually tasks which would be carried out during one of the central steps in the licensing process, i.e., the application, the study of the home, or the formulation of a recommendation for issuance or non-issuance of a license. Those items which received low ratings, however, were more often tasks which would be carried out while giving supervision-consultation to the licensee, performing community organization tasks of a licensing program, or in offering service to the natural parents of children in independent placement.

This division in the nature of items receiving high and low ratings on Factor I, with a few exceptions, was consistent with the opinions of social workers in the early identification of tasks and consistent also with a pattern of agency practice that the project staff had observed in its work with licensing trainees and supervisors. Items receiving high ratings appeared to be those tasks which are contained in the generally best understood aspects of licensing, tasks which occur most frequently in current practice, and which are often considered essential to a licensing program even though the agency is not in a position to extend as full an application of the licensing process as would be desirable. Those items which experts gave the lowest ratings corresponded to those tasks less usually found in all licensing programs, tasks which are generally less well understood, and which may be more readily overlooked or dispensed with when pressures for other services are great and staff is in short supply.

Tasks with the higher ratings might be characterized as the most "central" tasks in the licensing process for meeting agency responsibility on an acceptable though minimal basis; items with lower ratings could be characterized as "peripheral" tasks for meeting minimal agency responsibility.[14]

---

[14] See Table 5, p. 169 for fuller listing of the central and peripheral tasks.

FACTOR II, in turn, reflected values for which there was considerably less agreement among experts. There was acknowledgment of the importance of the central tasks of the licensing process, but in addition, an emphasis upon tasks which were rated as relatively less important in the early identification of tasks. These additional tasks given emphasis in Factor II were those characterized in Factor I as the peripheral tasks in the licensing of family homes, e.g., items dealing with tasks involved in extending supervision-consultation to the licensee, performing community organization activities, assessing plausibility of complaints against a licensee, gathering information about the psychological resources of an applicant's home.

Experts, in reflecting opinion on Factor II, were divided in their preference for rating instruments: Experts at the upper end of the dimension preferred items from the Supervisory Scale and experts at the lower end stressed the tasks contained in recording in general and gave relatively high ratings to almost all the items on the Record Rating Scale.

Choice of factor: It should be noted that, in the factor analysis, no pattern of values reflected by the panel members is eliminated completely. Each expert contributed in some measure to all of the patterns revealed. But a choice is made as to which value pattern should be emphasized in determining the set of scores which then identifies the level of competence sought. The choice of which factor to emphasize is made by examining the content of the items which were rated high by one group and low by another.

For purposes of this project, the staff sought a standard where there was a high degree of consensus among experts, as well as one which would be focused as much as possible on the central tasks of licensing. This decision was consistent with the early findings on the identification of tasks as to how social workers in licensing rate the relative importance of the various tasks. Furthermore, this emphasis appeared to be consistent with the intent to establish a level of minimal competence -- that level at which agency responsibility would be met at least minimally. Accordingly, then, the staff chose to emphasize Factor I in the standard of competence which was being determined. This factor had a high level of agreement among the experts; it placed most emphasis upon the central tasks of the licensing process; it favored neither of the two rating scales as a measure of performance.

However, someone with different purposes using the Supervisory and Record Rating Scales might reason as follows: "Certainly the most central aspects of licensing are important. However, since in my agency the workers are also expected to carry out all the more 'sophisticated' aspects of licensing, I would like also to emphasize these in the standard I choose." He would then favor Factor II -- position a. If on the other hand, the person using these scales had said, "I agree that carrying out all the central tasks of licensing is important for adequate performance. Nevertheless, I think that recording is especially important and I also have more faith in the Record Rating Scale than in the Supervisory Scale."

He then might choose the value pattern at the lower end (position b) of Factor II.[15]

Conclusions: While it is not yet possible to make a final assessment of the method of standard setting reported herein, it appears that the procedure has general usefulness and can be applied to a variety of situations and levels of social work practice.

The procedure appears particularly advantageous for these reasons. It contributes to the definition or analysis of a specific function by emphasizing the relative importance of the various tasks that enter into it. It clarifies the nature of consistent differences in opinions among experts about the function being studied. In this way, it is capable of pointing up important kinds and sources of variation in expert opinion. Thus, a researcher or agency administrator can make a choice about the value pattern to be emphasized in determining a level of competence. This choice could be in relation to an area of practice requiring attention or the purpose of a particular research study.

The method is a somewhat demanding one, however. It requires a relatively high degree of specificity in the initial identification of tasks within a given function and in the conversion of these tasks into items on a rating scale. The experts obviously need to be well selected and given clear and specific instructions for registering their opinions. There must exist a direction or rationale for the choice of factor which is finally to be adopted by the researcher or agency.

---

[15] See Table 6, p. 175, for fuller description and illustrations of how the particular position chosen as the standard determines the extent to which specific trainees meet or surpass the minimum standard of competence.

A standard of competence which is related to the tasks to be performed rather than to the specific qualifications of the performer can be built upon in making optimum use of scarce manpower. Moreover, a standard which meets agency responsibility minimally can probably be attained and has realistic meaning to agencies faced with problems of implementing a wide range of services.

Development of Curriculum and Teaching Materials

In addition to the identification of licensing tasks and the development of a standard of competence, there was a third major activity which preceded the demonstrations. This was the development of a curriculum and a set of teaching materials.

Instruction has been based upon a syllabus[16] organized into eight chapters, each of which is followed by a list of teaching objectives, questions for discussion, and required reading.

Constructing the syllabus pointed up the necessity of renouncing any attempt to train "miniature social workers." Attempting to train nonprofessionals "in our own image" has often seemed the best we could offer, especially in view of the dearth of training materials geared to the needs of the nonprofessional. But, in fact, this has often led to resistance, rivalry, or inhibition of natural response and use of self. If people without graduate social work education are to be trained for maximum usefulness to the social work profession, then their jobs should be delineated clearly, and they should not be regarded as some form of "instant social worker" turned out after a rapid training course.

---

[16] Lela B. Costin and Jennette R. Gruener, The Licensing of Family Homes in Child Welfare. A Guide for Instructors and Trainees (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965.)

The staff of the project is convinced that there are social welfare positions for which able persons not interested in seeking graduate education can be recruited, and that these positions can be made interesting and rewarding to college graduates. If, however, persons carrying out these jobs are to do so with conviction and success, training for these positions under any auspices must focus on the immediate tasks they will be expected to perform. Social work values and principles may be interwoven throughout the instruction, but the bulk of instruction must be on the "hows" of performing certain tasks in certain kinds of situations.

From this point of view, the syllabus for this demonstration course begins with the immediate matter that has brought the trainee to this learning situation -- what child care licensing is and what its goals are. This is followed by information to serve as a framework for understanding and appreciating the licensing function: the meaning of substitute care to parents, children, and foster parents; how and where children are cared for outside their own homes; the variety of reasons why foster care may become necessary; factors in the employment of mothers; and examples of the responsibility of the state to protect young children.

Intensive study of the statutory basis of licensing gives the trainee an understanding and appreciation of the basic legal framework of the administrative functions of licensing, and specific knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of the licensing law in his own state. Standards and the process of formulating standards are dealt with next: the nature of licensing standards, what standards are trying to achieve, and the licensing standards of the trainee's own state.

To attempt to teach the topic "growth and development of the child in the family" in a limited time is very difficult. To minimize the inevitable frustration for both trainee and staff and to make the new knowledge as directly useful as possible, discussion is focused on the relation of licensing standards to the wholesome growth and development of children who must live away from home. Only by continually relating standards to sound theory about the needs of children and their families can the goals of licensing be fully achieved.

In all the teaching materials, an effort is made to avoid having the trainee acquire a technical vocabulary or feel pressure to make a clinical diagnosis of behavior. Rather, the goals set before the students are: (1) to acquire a familiarity with some basic principles about child development and family life; (2) to acquire awareness of the special needs of children who experience separation from their own families; (3) to learn to interpret and apply licensing standards in their relationship to conditions that make for healthy personality growth in children; (4) to learn to recognize "trouble" in a child's behavior or in family life and to know the means available for getting help in understanding this problem behavior and taking some positive action; and (5) to provide knowledge about the sources of information that would enable the trainee to extend his learning about the dynamics of human behavior, and to instill the interest and desire for continuous learning.

Almost half of the syllabus is devoted to intensive study of the licensing process. This becomes the central learning focus for the trainee. The various phases of the licensing process -- the application, the study, the recommendation for approval or rejection for issuance of a license, supervision and consultation to the licensee, and termination -- are examined for an understanding of the goal and the specific tasks of each phase.

The next two chapters deal with some differential aspects of family home licensing and community organization aspects of child care licensing.

The final chapter of the syllabus is devoted to examination of the philosophy of licensing in relation to the basic assumptions and principles of social work. The teaching objectives for this unit include attempts to give the nonprofessional trainee a basis for identification with the philosophy and values of social work, to broaden his perception of his job, and to give him, in the performance of his duties, the "backing" or support which comes from the possession and understanding of a philosophy about what one is doing.

In many in-service training programs for nonprofessional persons, the inclination has been to attempt to impart the assumptions and principles, which are so meaningful to the social worker, as early as possible in the training sessions. Experience tells us, however, that these are difficult concepts to grasp and integrate into practice, even for the graduate student who has a longer educational experience and a more gradual introduction into an agency case load. It appears that the nonprofessional worker is able to examine more critically these assumptions and principles and, hopefully, integrate them into practice after he has acquired some degree of knowledge and security in the performance of the particular tasks to which he is assigned.

In addition to the syllabus, which provides the core of the instruction, various other teaching materials were developed or adapted. Case material was assembled and related to the syllabus subject matter and its teaching objectives. In this, numerous single interviews or "fragments" of case records are presented to help the trainee conceptualize his responsibilities as a licensing worker, increase his knowledge about the behavior and problems of children and their families, and develop skills in the application of standards, evaluation, and decision making. These exercises can be used in supervised study in either a classroom or with the supervisor, or in self-study.[17]

---

[17] Mildred S. Johnson, Case Exercises in the Licensing of Family Homes (Urbana, Illinois: The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, 1964), mimeographed.

Other materials included a film guide, written assignments, and a library of books and articles which are the reading assignments suggested at the end of each chapter of the syllabus.

Techniques were suggested to all the training groups to add variety, and to stimulate and reinforce learning. For example, role playing was suggested to give practice in interviewing techniques in a variety of situations. This, in turn, provides a real-life situation for practice in recording. Plays, small group discussions, and individual instructor-trainee advisory conferences were also advocated.

A Pilot Demonstration

A fourth important kind of planning activity was contained in an early pilot training program carried on in cooperation with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services.[18]

The purpose of this early program was to test the usefulness of cooperation between a school of social work and a child welfare division of a state agency in the area of training nonprofessional staff members, as well as the feasibility of further investigation into the nature of a licensing program and ways of training the nonprofessional person for the tasks contained in the licensing function.

---

[18] For a full description of the Pilot Project, see previously submitted reports: "Progress Report, December 15, 1962," and "An Experiment in Training for Licensing Independent Family Homes: Report of a Pilot Project," November, 1963.

A training course was conducted by project staff on the School's premises for six trainees from five regional offices. For ten days trainees attended lectures and discussion for five hours per day. They returned then to their regional offices for three weeks of experience under the supervision of their agency supervisor, after which they returned to the campus for three additional days of discussion and study. Various means for evaluating their performance were experimented with during the next five to six months of work experience.

This pilot demonstration provided very useful experiences and pointed up directions in these areas: the necessity for effective communication between school and agency, the kinds of work pressures present in public welfare settings, ways to enrich the curriculum to make it more directly applicable to the licensing function, the need for an integrated core of instruction, the usefulness of variety in teaching methods, the advisability of a longer interval of work experience between training periods, and necessary adaptations in evaluation procedures and revisions of evaluative instruments.

Summary: A considerable quantity and variety of activity preceded the three major demonstrations contained in this project. This activity, which had a reinforcing circularity, included an identification of the licensing tasks, a determination of their relative importance according to the opinions of social workers in the field, the construction of a curriculum and training materials directly related to practice, an analysis of the nature of the central and peripheral tasks in the licensing function, the establishment of a level of competence focused on agency responsibility against which a trainee's performance can be measured, and finally a trial run, a pilot training program.

We turn now to a description of the three major demonstrations of training.

III. THREE DEMONSTRATIONS

Training Method I

Following the major pre-demonstration operations which have been described, and the development of evaluation procedures (to be described below), the next task to be accomplished, and one which proved unexpectedly difficult, was the recruitment of applicants[1] for the first means of training: a course of instruction for nonprofessional trainees to be provided by The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work. This course consisted of a three weeks' training program on the University campus, broken by eight weeks of experience on the job. A letter of invitation to participate was sent to the welfare departments of 15 states in the spring of 1963. If interested, the administrators were asked to make nominations from which 15 students would be selected for training.

As their part in the project, participating departments would agree to employ their designated trainee for at least six months following training and to assign to him, as a substantial part of his work load, the licensing of family homes. The supervision supplied the trainee would follow the pattern of the agency for other workers but the supervisor would give his trainee as varied and extensive case experiences in licensing of family homes as possible and would also at the end of the project, participate with the project staff in evaluating the trainee's work performance.

---

[1] See Progress Report, December, 1964, for more detailed information about recruitment experiences with all three groups.

In every state approached, except possibly two, there was strong, enthusiastic interest in the project at the state level, and appreciation for the efforts of a graduate school of social work to involve its staff in public welfare's immense problem in the training and use of nonprofessional staff. Finding a working basis for the tangible expression of these common interests, however, presented a number of administrative problems which, while not insolvable, required time and effort on the part of the project staff and the various child welfare staffs involved.

The students and their supervisors: The final enrollment in the campus training course consisted of nine trainees from the states of Iowa (4), Illinois (1), Indiana (1), Ohio (2), and Mississippi (1). During the eight weeks of work experience between the first two weeks of training and the third, the Mississippi Department withdrew from the project because it was not able to give the trainee the kind of work experiences the project required. Five of the eight trainees who completed the course were recent college graduates in their twenties; three were older. All but one were women, the one man being in the younger age group. Five trainees had had no social work experience, two had had about six to eight months of experience with an undifferentiated public assistance and child welfare case load. None had had experience in licensing, however, nor had they had formal in-service training in their agencies.

Six of the trainees were on the staffs of county offices of a department of public welfare that administered both child welfare and public assistance programs. Four of these trainees' supervisors had master's degrees in social work, one had one year of graduate training in social work, and the sixth had an undergraduate degree and many years of public welfare experience.

In all of these six county offices, licensing was a function to be newly implemented. The supervisors of these trainees consequently had limited experience in this area. None of them had a unit of licensing workers to supervise. All of them supervised workers who were responsible for undifferentiated child welfare case loads and, in some instances, public assistance cases as well. As a result, these were supervisors who felt the administrative pressures that accompany public child welfare responsibility for children in agency care, who needed to use staff at hand, and who many times needed to give preference to direct services over the licensing function. Only one of the six trainees in this kind of setting had a full-time assignment to licensing activity, and this trainee had limited accessibility to the supervisor's time and help.

The remaining two trainees were in settings where their supervisors directed a licensing or homefinding unit of workers. One supervisor had an undergraduate degree with a home economics major in child development and an orientation toward day care. The second of the supervisors was on the staff of a local, private day care agency to which the licensing function had been delegated. Information about this supervisor's educational background was not obtained.

In all instances, the supervisors had heavy assignments and limited time for supervision of any individual worker. As a result, the supervisory activity was mostly of an administrative nature. This meant that only a negligible amount of time could be devoted to the teaching aspects of supervision.

Some of the supervisors had been involved very little, if at all, in the state department's decision to participate in the project, even though they may have cooperated in the application process. The group of supervisors were, in all instances, cooperative and helpful when direct requests were made, but there was great unevenness among them in the degree of real interest in the project and in the readiness to maintain a consistent and supportive supervisory relationship with the trainee in regard to licensing activity.

Liaison between project staff and participating departments: A liaison was designated by the head of each participating state department. One was a state consultant for staff development, one was a state consultant for day care services, and two were state supervisors of day care service and other child welfare services.

As a preliminary step in the training course, the immediate supervisors of the trainees and the liaisons from the state staffs were brought to the campus for a one-day meeting. This was for the purpose of discussion and suggestions about the project, examination of training curriculum materials, and discussion of mutual responsibilities between school and agency in the evaluation of the project. This meeting seemed to be quite helpful in stimulating and reinforcing interest and a sense of responsibility for the project on the part of the trainees' immediate supervisors.

None of the liaisons had a clear line of responsibility for directing the use of staff time. This meant that when difficulties were encountered in a trainee's being able to meet project requirements during the period of work experience following training, the state liaison was limited in his ability to solve the problems. He acted in all instances as a consultant. He encouraged persons at all levels concerned with the project; he helped to assess realistically the problems in local offices; he offered suggestions for meeting problems; he was a principal communicator between project staff and local public welfare departments.

During the period of work experience following training, a project staff member made field visits to the state and local offices where trainees were located. These visits played an important part in keeping lines of communication open, in reinforcing the participation of trainees' supervisors, and in resolving some barriers to the trainees being able to have a substantial work experience in licensing which was to provide a basis for evaluating the training method.

The training session: The trainees came to the campus for a period of instruction from July 22 through August 2, 1963. This intensive instruction was followed by eight weeks of work experience in the trainee's home office. The trainees again came to the campus for training from September 30 through October 4. The total number of hours the trainees spent in class sessions was the equivalent of that in a university four-hour semester course, although these hours were more closely spaced.

The second period of training was followed by six months of work experience at which time the evaluation of the trainees' performance was completed.

The instruction was given by four staff members, three of whom served as advisers to individual trainees individually and in small groups. As much as possible, a diversity of approach was used to minimize fatigue. Evenings were given to preparation of assignments for the next day and to use of the reading materials. A library of required reading matter was assembled and installed in the room of one of the trainees, who acted as librarian. Tape recorders were made available to the trainees outside the class hours to practice interviewing.

The staff met at the end of each day to review progress, identify areas needing attention, and to try as fully as possible to present a total, integrated course of instruction.

The trainees, with the exception of one whose performance was uneven, seemed eager to learn, approached their work with considerable enthusiasm, followed through meticulously with all assignments, and conscientiously and inquiringly participated. Not only was this true during class sessions, but it was also observed that discussions continued during breaks and sometimes during the lunch hour, vigorously and with keen interest. There was considerable rapport, and trainees began early to state frankly and objectively with one another their differences of opinion and to give support to one another's thinking when occasion demanded. This alertness and interest made it possible to maintain a fast pace and an intense work level.

Several trainees indicated that they were learning as much outside of class as within. Because they were housed on the same floor of the Illini Union Building, many of them, in groups of two or three, thrashed out questions together. The bibliographical materials apparently were well used if the check-out cards are an indication, and the discussion within the class certainly seemed to reflect use of the required readings.

Prior to their return for the third week of instruction, the trainees and their supervisors were asked to submit, on a form provided them, their assessment of the degree to which certain areas had been adequately handled in instruction and those areas in which the trainee needed more help.

Trainees listed more areas for needed additional help than did supervisors, which was only partially explained by the fact that not all supervisors returned the form. There was a wide listing of areas in which individual trainees wanted further discussion, but a consistent cluster of interest appeared in: (1) the growth and development of the child in the family; (2) recording; (3) community education about licensing; (4) recommendation for approval or rejection of license; (5) supervision-consultation; and (6) invocation of authority. Supervisors also showed consistent interest in further attention being paid to invocation of authority and supervision-consultation and, in addition, said that trainees needed further help in the use of agency supervision.

For use in third-week sessions, the trainees provided descriptions of two of their own cases, which they presented for class discussion and comments. This class presentation replaced the film hour in this third week.

In the discussions during the third week, it was evident that all of the trainees were quite "involved" in their job assignments, and were very ready to relate all of the material presented to their actual on-the-job situations and problems.

In contrast to the first training period, when the trainees had systematically followed the training agenda presented by the project staff, the trainees in their second training period were eager to "set the program" themselves, so as to take advantage of the sessions to learn what they felt a need to know.

Training Method II

The second method used in providing training in licensing for nonprofessional workers was that in which the instruction was given on the job by an agency's own staff. In this demonstration the same curriculum materials were used and the same general plan of instruction was followed as in the University-based part of the project.

To test the feasibility of this method, an attempt was made to find one or two state welfare departments that would be interested in participating through their own in-service training program. The departments were asked to recruit trainees with the same general qualifications as the group in the training course under the School of Social Work auspices, to conduct similar brief periods of orientation in their offices prior to training, and then to carry out an in-service training program for the trainees using the curriculum materials developed in the project in consultation with project staff. The intent was to permit the state to use the materials flexibly within its own in-service training pattern. The job performance of the trainees during a period of work experience following training would be evaluated in the same way as was being done for the other groups of trainees.

Two states (Indiana and Texas, to be referred to as State A and State B) participated in this phase of the program. The Indiana Department of Public Welfare concluded its period of work experience following training in January, 1965, and Texas concluded in June, 1965.

The State A demonstration: The ten trainees in State A's training course came from various rural or small urban counties in the state. None were from counties that participated in our other demonstrations. Five of the trainees were about 21 years old, and five were over 30, with four of these latter five being over 45 years. All but one were women, the one man being in the older group.

The trainees represented two distinct groups of employees. All those in the younger age group were college undergraduates who were employed for the summer months and assigned full-time to the licensing of family homes or small home-operated day care centers. The other five were regular full-time employees, "caseworkers," who expected to continue with the agency beyond the life of the project. One of these had been employed by the department for one year and another for four years prior to the demonstration. All of the regular employees had had varying periods of different kinds of work experience, e.g., teaching, school attendance officer, police officer. Of the five in the older group, one was assigned full time to the licensing function, one was assigned one-half time to licensing and the other three gave one-third or less time to licensing. Their additional assignments were in relation to other child welfare services.

Four of the five "summer trainees" had completed the junior year of college, and one had completed the sophomore year. Of the five older trainees, three had an undergraduate degree, one had three years of undergraduate work, and one had been in college only one year.

Education of the supervisors varied from "some college courses" to the M.S.W. degree. Three of the ten supervisors had such a degree; two had one year of graduate social work education; two had an A.B. degree; and three had not completed college.

All ten supervisors had heavy work assignments. Four had administrative as well as supervisory responsibilities, three as county directors, one as a state consultant. Five were assigned full time to supervision and, except for one who had only child welfare workers to supervise, all had responsibility for supervising workers who had both child welfare and public assistance cases. One supervisor was newly assigned to supervision for this project and carried a case load for the remainder of her work assignment.

All of the counties participating in the demonstration were either just beginning to implement the licensing law or rebuilding a program that had been inactive for a number of years. The supervisors varied in their knowledge and conviction about licensing. For the most part, they had very limited experience, if any, in licensing; they had not had opportunity to observe practice where the licensing function was carried out with assurance and skill, and they were heavily engaged in the more familiar parts of the child welfare program.

The state department's preliminary interest in participating in this cooperative demonstration came from various persons in the Children's Division who had knowledge of the project because of the state's participation in the other two training demonstrations. The staff development consultant was assigned responsibility for exploration of the feasibility of such an in-service training program and for developing and carrying out the program which followed.

A member of the project staff worked closely with the staff development consultant during all of the planning phase. The staff development consultant was conscientious in all details and enthusiastic about the possibilities of such a project. She brought a "freshness" in her contacts with already hard-pressed public welfare staff which generated interest in the project and willingness to extend time and effort a little further.

Training sessions were conducted in the department's state office building for one week, June 29 to July 3, 1964, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. This was followed by a three-and-one-half week period of work experience in the county offices. Trainees then returned to the state office for two days of training sessions, July 30 and 31.

In addition to the staff development consultant, who directed and coordinated the program and taught some of the sessions as well, eight other persons participated in the teaching. These persons were other members of the state department staff, two social workers from local voluntary agencies, two members of the project staff, and representatives from the State Board of Health and the State Fire Marshal's office.

The staff development consultant reported each session on a form provided by project staff.[2] In addition, telephone calls were utilized in the evenings to exchange information, to supplement the written reports, and for project staff to give consultative suggestions about the teaching materials.

---

[2] See Appendix A, p. 8.

At the conclusion of training on July 31, the trainees returned to their own county offices for a period of work experience. Summer trainees concluded their work experience and tests and case records for evaluation by September 15, 1964. The five permanent employees in the older group concluded the period of project work experience and tests and case records for evaluation by January 1, 1965.

There are certain positive and negative aspects to the demonstration which can be assessed even in the absence of the formal evaluative materials. At the end of the training, the staff development consultant reported what she termed certain observable "side effects." For instance, one state consultant in child welfare, after having become familiar with the training materials, urged that these be used regularly for yearly or semi-annual workshops to train personnel in licensing. County supervisors who had previously had concern about the use of summer trainees expressed gratification that the summer trainees in the project had been given some training with a specific assignment to carry out while they were in the county department. Several trainees were stimulated to do more "self-learning." One of the older trainees came in for an individual conference to discuss her desire to go back to school to take additional courses in the social sciences, and for advice about registering at a university extension center. The instructors from the voluntary agencies asked permission to use the syllabus and case exercises with their own staffs because they thought the content was very good and adaptable, in part, to other settings.

On the other hand, it is probable that insufficient training time was provided to achieve maximum effectiveness. In addition, the training program was carried out and trainees sent into communities to license homes before sufficient interpretation had been given in many of these communities as to why an old law was now being implemented. This meant that the trainees had to work immediately in difficult kinds of licensing situations.

The State B demonstration: These trainees consisted of one man and two women in their early twenties. All had an undergraduate degree but no prior social agency experience. None were from counties that had previously participated in our training courses. Each trainee was assigned full time in a single county to the licensing of independent, full-time foster homes, family day care homes, or small day care centers.

Two of the three supervisors of the trainees had the M.S.W. degree and the other had two years of graduate social work education. All were supervisors in a regional office giving service to a number of counties.

The training course was under the direction and coordination of the Director of the Division of Training. A member of the project staff during the planning phase worked closely through a field visit and through correspondence, with the Director of Training, the regional licensing supervisor assigned to the teaching responsibility, and other members of the State Department of Public Welfare.

The state department indicated keen interest in the demonstration. It planned to incorporate such a course into the training program for continuous use in the future if it proved successful, or could be shown to be capable of success under improved conditions.[3]

In this demonstration, direct responsibility for the training sessions was lodged with a regional supervisor, a person experienced both in supervision and in licensing. In addition, she was versed in the content and use of the training materials because of her participation in the project's third demonstration, to be described below.

The training course extended over a four-week period. Classes were held at the Training Center in the state capitol. Trainees here had access to a well-designed and furnished seminar room and to the departmental library. Each trainee had his own office for study. The instructor was available for conferences in a private office. The physical setting was nearly ideal for a training program.

Group instruction was given each morning, focused on the content of the project training materials, with discussion, auditory and visual aids to supplement the course content. In the afternoon, each trainee participated in field experiences by assignment of licensing cases from the regional licensing office which had headquarters in the state capitol. The regional supervisor, who was responsible for the class sessions, supervised the field experiences. She reported each class session to project staff on a form provided, as had State A, and these were replied to in correspondence.

---

[3] Recent correspondence indicates that this has been done. One additional course has been completed and another is underway.

After the training sessions ended, the trainees returned to their own county offices and, under the supervision of a non-resident supervisor, undertook a period of work experience.

Certain apparent strengths in this demonstration stand out. This was a sufficiently long training course to give time to integrate learning. There was one instructor who had major responsibility for teaching and supervision of field work, which should provide maximum opportunity to give a complete, individualized learning experience. Field work provided an enrichment to the usual in-service training course. The trainees were carefully selected for the particular tasks. The instructor had had practice in the use of the training materials and experience over a long period of time in the implementation of the licensing law in this state.

While States A and B are so different that direct comparisons between these two demonstrations are not possible, their contrasting experiences provide interesting material for others who are planning staff development programs in licensing.

Training Method III

The third method of training to be demonstrated involved the preparation of a group of child welfare agency supervisors to assume responsibility for training, through supervision, of at least one worker assigned to the licensing of independent full-time or day care family homes or small "home-operated" day care centers.

This method was seen as one which, if successful, could fit into the already existing administrative pattern of public welfare. Furthermore, if a supervisor was enabled to learn a method of training through supervision, and provided curriculum materials with which to teach, then he would be in a position to train others who might come into the agency at some future time, and the results of the project would become cumulative in effect.

Another consideration in the decision to demonstrate this particular method of training related to the significance of the role of the individual supervisor in public welfare settings. The supervisor of the nonprofessional worker has a determining influence in the kinds of work assignments given to staff, the nature of agency expectations for performance from workers, the degree of importance which the worker attaches to various parts of his assignment, and the actual level of performance which the worker is able to maintain. The child welfare supervisor is a key person, therefore, in the implementation of licensing programs.

Early in February, 1964, invitations to participate in the demonstration were sent to all state departments of welfare known to have a licensing law applicable to family homes, either full time or day care. To participate in the project, a department would have to designate one of its supervisors as a working member of a two-session course on the campus of The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois.

This supervisor would have to be one who was engaged in the supervision of at least one worker assigned to the licensing function. Following the sessions on the campus, the supervisor would be expected to train at least one nonprofessional worker, using a teaching plan which he would work out during the supervisors' session and using teaching materials developed by the project. Evaluations would be carried on by the project staff although supervisors were asked to cooperate by making an appropriate time and place available to the trainee for the various tests and by completing a supervisory rating of the assigned trainee.

This training demonstration was held on the University campus in the summer of 1964. Enrollment in the course consisted of 16 supervisors from nine states -- New York (1); Pennsylvania (2); Ohio (1); Indiana (2); Iowa (1); Nebraska (1); Minnesota (4); Missouri (1); and Texas (3).

Three of the 16 supervisors came from homefinding or licensing units within a local or regional office. The others had diversified supervisory loads with responsibility for the supervision of workers with all the various kinds of child welfare responsibilities. Seven of the supervisors had previous knowledge and experiencing in licensing; six had knowledge and experience in agency homefinding, but had never focused on licensing per se; three were new both to homefinding and to licensing.

For training, the 16 supervisors had 20 worker-trainees in total. Four of them had two workers in training, the others were training one worker each.

Of these trainees, two were men, 18 were women. The age range was from 21 to 58 years, with four under 25, seven in the 25 to 35 year range, six from 35 to 45 years and four from 45 up. Seventeen of the trainees had A.B. degrees; three had over two years of undergraduate education.

Twelve of the 20 trainees had no previous social agency experience before being assigned to participate in the project, although most of them had other kinds of work experience -- teaching, nursing, secretarial, or recreational work. The other eight trainees had varying amounts of social agency experience.

In each participating state, the director of the department of public welfare delegated responsibility for liaison with the project staff to a staff member on the state level. Five of these persons were staff development directors or consultants, two were consultants in day care or foster home care, and two were heads of the child welfare service in the states. The role of the liaison in each state was the same as in the other demonstrations.

A meeting of these liaison representatives and the project staff was held before the first supervisors' training session. Its purpose was to review training materials, teaching methods, evaluative procedures and mutual responsibilities of school and agencies, and to discuss specific problems, concerns and suggestions of the states in relation to the project. Five of the nine states sent their liaison representative to this meeting.

Training for the supervisors was conducted on the campus of the University in two sessions about two months apart, the first session being one week in duration and the second, three days. Class sessions were held about six hours each day.

The focus during the two training sessions was upon the nature of the licensing process, the particular learning problems of the nonprofessional workers, the use of teaching materials, and supplementary resources in the supervision and teaching of the nonprofessional worker in licensing. Emphasis was put on the supervisor's use of training materials rather than on mastery of content.

Instruction was carried on chiefly by two project staff members, with assistance from one other. Each supervisor was given one primary assignment for the first week's session: the preparation of a teaching plan to use with his trainee upon his return to his office. These plans were discussed in individual conferences with a project staff member before the end of the week.

The first period of training proved to be a difficult experience for both project staff and supervisors. While the staff felt generally satisfied with the course by the end of the first week, at no point had there been the kind of enthusiastic response and active involvement with the material that had been present with the nonprofessional trainees who had come to the campus during the first demonstration.

A number of factors appear to have contributed to this. In the first place, project staff overestimated the extent to which the supervisors would be interested in rather intensive study and encountered a lack of readiness to participate in class sessions on the level which had been anticipated and planned. This miscalculation was compounded when the project staff did not count on late arrivals or a level of fatigue felt by supervisors from travel that was preceded by effort to finish work in their offices to enable them to be away from their desks for a week.

Not enough time was allowed the supervisors for a gradual transition into a learning situation, and project staff moved too quickly into course content without sufficient opportunity to allow the members of the group to know each other. These mistakes were recognized and acknowledged to the group by the project staff early in the week. The acknowledgment of error and recognition of feelings helped to reduce the initial resistance of supervisors.

There were, however, other more basic reasons for some of the resistance, and this kind of resistance was slower to be resolved. One reason was that for at least half of the group there had been ineffective communication about the project, its purpose, and commitments. This appeared more often among the supervisors whose states had not sent liaisons to the prior meeting with project staff. While some of the supervisors had seen all the correspondence and information sent to state offices by project staff or had conferences with their state liaison, others had not. Some of the latter were unprepared for the length of time to be devoted to project participation and for the work required in connection with it.

These persons felt they had been "sent" to the training sessions with little or no choice about participation.

Other underlying factors in the early resistance shown by some members of the group related to disparity among the supervisors in the amount of knowledge, experience, and conviction about the licensing function, skepticism about demonstrations and research in social work, and reluctance to take on anything new no matter how interesting it might turn out to be because they expected little or no reduction of their regular load to meet additional demands brought about by project requirements.

Nevertheless, all of the supervisors were conscientious, responsible individuals who felt an obligation to their agencies. They were resilient and accustomed to meeting demands and postponing their own preferences in work assignments. It was these characteristics that enabled the project staff, laboring to establish effective communication, to help the group move from early resistance and confusion about the project to some enthusiastic involvement by the middle of the week, which then leveled off to a sober kind of commitment to the project by the time the week ended. One supervisor could almost have been speaking for the group when he said he could express his feelings in the same way as his county director had, when the project was first discussed in his office by the state liaison: "I'm getting interested and I don't want to."

During the interim period, between the July and September sessions, each supervisor began the training of his nonprofessional worker, following the teaching plan set up earlier. Each week the supervisor sent to the project staff a report of training sessions on a form provided for that purpose.[4] A project staff member replied to these with suggestions and acknowledgment of progress.

The reports reflected considerable variation in the teaching plan being followed by different supervisors. Most of them met individually with their trainee during specified conference times, although some included other staff members occasionally and did more group teaching. Most of the supervisors gave attention to all sections of the syllabus, and most were positively involved with the course content.

Most of the supervisors directed their trainee to move systematically through the syllabus content, a few going page-by-page with their trainee, learning together. Several supervisors dipped here and there in the training material, selecting that which seemed to fit their trainees' work needs at a specific time. As a total group, the supervisors showed on their report forms that most attention was devoted to Chapter V of the syllabus, that which focuses most directly on the licensing process, and least time was spent on Chapter III, which had to do with the nature of licensing standards and the application of standards. There was great variation in the extent to which additional training materials were used, e.g., case exercises, reading references.

Most of the supervisors consistently expressed frustration about lack of time for thorough consideration of the training material and the difficulty in adhering to regular conference times. Often trainees did their reading and studying outside of office hours. Supervisors sometimes were frank about their own limitations as they tried to improve their skills in teaching, e.g., "I find myself talking too much," "I do not know the material myself."

---

[4] See Appendix A, pp. 3-7.

The reports reflected a number of factors which had a conditioning effect upon the success of the venture: the degree of interest and support of the state and local administration, the extent to which teaching was regarded as an appropriate task of supervision, the interest and learning ability of the trainee, the nature of the office setting for study, work, and conference.

On the first day of the September session, individual conferences were held with each supervisor to learn more about his individual situation and to identify major concerns that needed discussion in the group. The September session was, in many ways, easier and more satisfying for all concerned. The supervisors had moved into training with their trainees; they were more fully acquainted with training materials; they were more involved with bringing about an effective application of the licensing process and appeared to be somewhat more of a "group."

After the return of the supervisors to their own offices, correspondence with them continued until the end of the demonstration period in February, 1965.

Summary: Three training demonstrations for a total of 41 nonprofessional licensing workers have been described.

Training Method I included eight trainees from four states who participated in a training course conducted under the auspices of, and on the premises of, a graduate school of social work.

Training Method II included State A and State B, each of whom conducted an in-service training program under agency auspices, for ten and three trainees respectively.

Training Method III was comprised of a course given by the graduate school for 16 child welfare supervisors from nine states, each of the supervisors then training at least one nonprofessional worker under the auspices of his agency, a total of 20 trainees.

It is apparent that each of the three training demonstrations reflected certain like characteristics: the same curriculum and teaching materials, instruction based on comparable teaching objectives, similar periods of on-the-job experience following formal training (except for the five summer employees of State A).

But each demonstration was different in certain other ways: in the number of hours or days of formal training, in the size of the training groups, in the characteristics of or social work position held by the teaching personnel, and in some of the instructional techniques used.

Noting these similarities and differences, we turn to the results of an evaluation of the three training demonstrations.

IV. EVALUATION

The evaluation procedures were used to assess the demonstrations in order to answer such basic questions as: Can the nonprofessional person perform the various central and peripheral tasks contained in the licensing of family homes at a level of competence which meets agency responsibility? What are the findings from a comparison of the three demonstrated ways of training?

Many problems were encountered in the development and carrying out of the evaluation. The usual problems in measurement were made even more complex in this kind of situation because instruments to measure the particular skills in the licensing function were not at hand. A further problem was found in the fact that no generally accepted standards had been set by the social work profession, for either the licensing worker or for the nonprofessional worker in other child welfare tasks. The many obstacles to getting adequate and stable control groups in a public welfare setting have been noted earlier. Moreover, the many variations in our trainees' work situations made it difficult to adapt the same evaluative plan to the varying field conditions.

In determining how to evaluate, our approach was (1) to analyze the component parts of the licensing process, considering both the several phases of the process and the specific tasks of each phase; (2) to establish criteria of performance which experts in the field of licensing agree upon; (3) to define a minimal level of acceptable competence for each test; and

(4) to determine levels of performance of the trainees in relation to the criteria.

A description of evaluation measures used and the results obtained follows.

The Nature of the Groups to be Trained

Before proceeding to an examination of the extent to which the nonprofessional person can perform the tasks of licensing, the question arises: Were the three groups of trainees relatively alike in relation to certain identifiable characteristics, or were there significant differences between the groups?

Table 7 summarizes the characteristics of the three groups of trainees in relation to age, levels of education, and previous social work experience. It indicates that the groups were quite similar in composition in relation to these variables.[1]

Were the groups also alike in levels of verbal reasoning ability, which might directly influence the level of competence which was attained? To obtain information to answer this question, Part I of the School and College Ability Test[2] was given to each trainee at the beginning of training. Table 7 also summarizes these results. No significant differences were found among groups of trainees.

---

[1] See Table 7, p. 178.

[2] Examiner's Manual: Cooperative School and College Ability Tests (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1955).

What could be learned of the trainees' expressed attitudes about family life? Would the groups be similar in this area also? The Parental Attitude Research Instrument[3] was administered to each trainee at the beginning of training. Table 7 shows that there were no significant differences among the mean scores of the demonstration groups on each of the three factors measured: authoritarian control, hostile-rejecting, and democratic.

The groups of trainees, then, were relatively alike in attitudes toward family life as expressed on the PARI. But might they, as a total group, be expressing highly individual attitudes which would aid or interfere with their ability to perform the tasks in the licensing of family homes? To answer this, at least partially, trainees' scores were compared with scores of social work graduate students and education graduate students (mostly elementary and secondary teachers returned for additional summer work). Again, no significant differences between mean scores on the three factors were found.[4]

---

[3] E. S. Schaefer and R. Q. Bell, "Development of a Parental Attitude Research Instrument," Child Development, XXIX, No. 3 (September, 1958), pp. 339-361.

M. Zuckerman, B. B. Ribback, I. Monashkin, and J. A. Norton, "Normative Data and Factor Analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII, No. 3 (June, 1958), pp. 165-171.

[4] See Table 8, p. 179.

In summary, it appears that the composition of the various training groups of nonprofessional trainees was a relatively homogeneous one, at least in relation to the variables which were assessed -- age, levels of education, social work experience, verbal reasoning ability, and certain attitudes toward family life.

The question also arose as to whether these trainees were representative of nonprofessional staff persons generally available to the public welfare agency. In the absence of normative data about the characteristics of nonprofessional staff members widely used in social welfare positions, the question cannot be definitively answered. However, from our knowledge of the hiring procedures and recruiting methods used by the states who participated in the project, it appears reasonable to assume that these trainees were generally representative and did not constitute a highly selected or atypical group of nonprofessional trainees.

Did the Trainees Achieve Knowledge of the Content Taught?

If possession of knowledge about the licensing function is a prerequisite to being able to apply such knowledge, then one of the first questions to ask in assessing the success of a training course is: How much did the trainee learn of the content which was taught? Did he have significantly more knowledge of the materials in the curriculum when the course ended than when it began?

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] found that the trainee groups [illegible] during training [illegible] — the extent to which the [illegible] minimally adequate competence in the performance of [illegible] eral tasks in the licensing of family homes.

---

[5] See Progress Report, December [illegible], pp. [illegible], for a fuller description of the development and revision of the test. See Appendix [illegible], pp. 15-23 for copy of the test.

[6] See Table 9, p. 180.

Supervisory Rating Scale: The first approach to answering this question was to find out whether the employing agencies had been satisfied with the trainees' performance during the six-months period of work following training.

Social workers have long relied upon the opinions of supervisory personnel to evaluate the performance of workers. The tasks in any social welfare position are numerous and do not lend themselves easily to observations or numerical assessment. Therefore, the degree of success by a particular worker frequently has had to be determined by a series of judgments by a person or persons who knows most about the specific responsibilities of the worker and the way he appears to meet them. The worker's immediate supervisor is regarded as having the fullest knowledge for this judgment.

As a method of overall evaluation of performance, supervisory ratings have at least two limitations. First, the supervisor is not in a position to know all aspects of a worker's performance or to judge the various parts of the performance equally well. With the heavy work loads in public agency settings, this limitation is a serious one. A second limitation of supervisory ratings lies in the fact that even when completed with great care, these ratings are quite subjective. This subjectivity derives from the complexity of the social work tasks and skills which supervisors are asked to evaluate. As a result, it is very difficult to define precisely this complex of duties and concomitant attitudes so that an objective standard, with a common frame of reference, can be achieved.

In spite of these limitations, the project staff decided that a supervisory rating scale should be included among the evaluation measures used to assess worker performance. The decision was based upon the importance attached to this form of worker evaluation in social work settings, its usefulness as a measure of agency satisfaction, and the need for some measure of performance which would be more comprehensive than the other measures used.

The scale devised for this purpose was based on the identification of tasks, divided as far as possible into finite, measurable parts. Each item in the Rating Scale defines a task and inquires about a certain degree of adequacy in performance.[7] The 93 tasks that were finally chosen[8] were divided into five categories of central tasks and eight categories of peripheral tasks.[9] The supervisor was asked to make two judgments for each item. First, he was to say whether the trainee had performed the given task five or more times during the six-months period of work experience following training. If not, the supervisor was to check the box for that task labeled No Basis for Judgment. However, if the trainee had performed the task at least five times, then the supervisor was to check his judgment of the trainee's performance along a frequency continuum. For example, one item on the scale was "Is trainee able to arrive at a thoroughly considered recommendation regarding licensability?" The supervisor would che[illegible]ng a continuum from Never to Always.

---

[7] See p. 16 for examples of items and the continuum along which the supervisor was asked to indicate his evaluation of the trainee's performance of that task. See also Appendix A, pp. 62-80 for a copy of the Supervisory Rating Scale.

[8] The original scale had one-hundred-and-forty items which was reduced to 93 items to eliminate duplication of supervisory judgments.

[9] See Table 5, p. 169 for full listing of the central and peripheral tasks.

Findings from supervisors' ratings (central tasks): A. Did the supervisors indicate that they were satisfied that most of the trainees had performed the central tasks of licensing of family homes at a level of competence which meets agency responsibility at least minimally? It will be recalled that the central tasks are those tasks which are best understood and most frequently found in practice and are contained mostly in the application, study of the home, and the recommendation for issuance or non-issuance of license.[10]

The answer to the question raised is clearly in the affirmative. Table 10[11] shows that 85 per cent of the 41 trainees received a final overall score which was at or above the level of minimally adequate competence in the performance of the central tasks. Looking at the three training groups individually, it is seen that Training Method II had the highest overall percentage of trainees (90 per cent) who achieved at least a minimally adequate final score on central tasks, with State A and Training Method I showing 80 per cent and 75 per cent respectively.[12]

---

[10] See p. 22 for examples of central tasks.

[11] See Table 10, p. 181, for achievement of Trainee Groups on the various categories of tasks. See Table 11 and 12, pp. 182 and 188, for achievement of Trainee Groups on specific tasks within categories.

B. Having noted that supervisors expressed a high degree of overall satisfaction with the performance of central tasks by their trainees, for which central tasks were supervisors relatively less satisfied with trainees' performance.

For the category, Recommendation, only 70 per cent of State A's trainees met the minimally adequate level of competence -- still a large majority of that group's trainees, but less than for either of the other two groups. Specific tasks included here were those in arriving at a thoroughly considered recommendation, and adequately supporting it by evidence in the case record.

Supervisors also indicated a lesser degree of satisfaction with trainee performance on tasks of Agency Structure. These tasks had to do with case recording, planning work load, maintaining statistical records as required by the agency, using agency supervision, and developing a professional identification consistent with the role of the licensing worker. For these tasks, 70 per cent of State A's trainees met the standard as against 85 per cent for Training Method III, and only 62.5 per cent of the trainees from Training Method I. Further attention will be given to these tasks as we proceed through additional evaluation measures.

---

[12] State B showed that 100 per cent of its trainees achieved at this level, but since this group contained only three trainees, it is not cited in relation to the other groups.

Findings from supervisors' ratings (peripheral tasks): A. Did the supervisors indicate that they were satisfied that most of the trainees had performed the peripheral tasks of licensing of family homes at a level of competence which meets agency responsibility at least minimally? Peripheral tasks have been identified as those tasks which are less generally well understood, less frequently found in practice, and more often dispensed with when other work pressures are heavy or staff is in short supply. These tasks are contained mostly in supervision-consultation, work with natural parents of children in independent care, and community organization tasks of licensing.[13]

Again, the answer is clearly in the affirmative. Table 10 shows that 93 per cent of the 41 trainees received a final overall score which was at or above the level of minimally adequate competence in the performance of the peripheral tasks.[14] Again it is Training Method III which had the highest percentage of trainees (95 per cent) who achieved at least a minimally adequate final score, with State A at 90 per cent and Training Method I at 87.5 per cent.[15]

---

[13] See p. 23 for examples of peripheral tasks.

[14] Since the percentages are higher for all three training groups on peripheral tasks than on central tasks, it should be noted that the supervisors actually rated the trainees higher on the central tasks. Because the experts regarded the peripheral tasks as less essential to meeting agency responsibility minimally, lower standard scores and weights were assigned to the peripheral tasks. This meant that a somewhat lower level of performance of these tasks still met the level of minimal adequacy.

[15] State B showed 100 per cent of its three trainees at this level.

B. For which peripheral tasks was there relatively less expressed satisfaction by supervisors, even though the overall evaluation was very positive?

An examination of performances on specific categories pointed out that trainees did least well on a set of tasks involving the use of authority. These tasks were contained in the Recommendation category and had to do with handling situations where the home is not licensable, rejecting a home at the time of relicensing, and offering the applicant opportunity to withdraw without damage from the rejection. Only 65 per cent of the trainees from Training Method III and 70 per cent from State A achieved minimal adequacy on these tasks.

In addition, agency structure tasks again show up as an area of dissatisfaction with 30 per cent of State A's trainees showing inability to perform these tasks at a minimally adequate level even when given an opportunity to carry out the tasks.

C. What peripheral tasks did trainees perform less frequently? The question is a suitable one in view of the fact that peripheral tasks have been described as less generally found in practice, less well understood, and more quickly dispensed with in agency practice.

Two categories of tasks stand out as having been performed less frequently, so that supervisors indicated that for a substantial number of trainees, they had no basis for judging performance. These tasks included work with natural parents of children in independent placement and community organization tasks of licensing.[16] It should be noted, however, that when trainees did perform these tasks, their supervisors were satisfied in a majority of the instances.

Areas requiring greatest amount of supervision: A classification was made of answers given by supervisors when they were asked to indicate at the end of the rating scale the areas in which trainees had needed the most supervision.[17]

By far the largest number of responses, almost twice that for any other type of response, was tasks of "agency structure." These were specified by supervisors as organizing work and use of time, recording, letter writing, statistical reporting, and understanding standards in relation to other governmental agencies.

Supervisors from all training groups indicated that trainees had needed considerable help in establishing relationships -- specifically, how to alleviate resistance of the applicant for licensing, how to use authority, the problem of over-identification with the licensee, and the need to individualize the applicant.

---

[16] Trainee activity in relation to the tasks of community organization is dealt with more specifically on pages 115 to 119. The general lack of licensing agency activity in relation to natural parents of children in independent care raises the question as to whose responsibility it should be to give services to the increasing numbers of parents whose children are in independent day care.

[17] See Table 13, p. 196.

Study tasks and interfering personal problems of trainee were also listed frequently as requiring extra help.

Trainees who failed to satisfy the agency: In view of the high degree of agency satisfaction expressed by a large majority of the supervisors who rated their trainees well above the minimal level, one is prompted to examine the findings to see who were the "failures."

Six of the 41 trainees -- two each from Group I, Group II, and Group III -- fell below the level of minimal adequacy on their overall score for central tasks. Three of these same six trainees (again one from each training group) also failed on the overall score for peripheral tasks.

In all six instances, there had been strong and consistently repeated indications of personality problems in the trainee or supervisor, or aspects of personality which interfered with satisfactory interaction between supervisor and trainee.

Summary of supervisors' ratings: Supervisors of nonprofessional trainees in all three training methods indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the trainees' performance of both central and peripheral tasks in the licensing of family homes.

They expressed relatively less satisfaction with tasks of "agency structure," the use of authority, and arriving at a sound judgment regarding licensability.

Two categories of tasks stand out as offering less basis for supervisory judgments about trainee performance because of insufficient opportunities to perform the stated tasks: work with the natural parents of children in independent placement and community organization tasks of licensing.

We turn now to an examination of evidence from other evaluative measures about the extent to which nonprofessional trainees showed competence in the performance of the tasks of licensing of family homes at a level which would meet agency responsibility at least minimally.

The Situational Test: An additional method was devised for appraising the trainees' ability to apply the knowledge and principles of licensing that were taught both in the formal teaching sessions and through experience on the job. This test was an indirect measure of performance. Its validity depended on the fact that the material used for these problem-solving situations was adapted from cases that frequently occur in licensing practice.

Ideas from staff members for the development of this test grew out of experience in the pilot project when trainees' case records were read and rated. This record reading, as well as some questions on the Content Examination test, showed that one of the areas of uneven or inadequate performance on the part of the trainees was in making a recommendation for approval or denial of the application for license. The question was raised as to whether the licensing worker was generally unable to exercise sound judgment in such cases or whether the trainees who seemed to use poor judgment had been subjected to external, determining pressures;

e.g., community demands for homes, the need to create a good public image where a licensing service was just beginning to be implemented, lack of supervisory or administrative backing to carry out a denial of license, or a heavy work load which prevented the worker from having sufficient time to consider adequately the issues relevant to sound judgment.

If pressures such as these had influenced some trainees' judgment, would they make the same errors when similar situations were presented in a highly focused form, stripped of these kinds of external, on-the-job pressures?

If trainees performed adequately on such a test, then there would be reason to believe that licensing workers could be taught to make sound judgments and that licensing practice could be substantially improved if administrators and supervisors took steps to reduce or control these pressures.

The Situational Test consisted of brief case vignettes, each presenting a specific situation to be evaluated.[18] The trainee was asked to choose the correct item from a list of multiple choice responses, each item representing either a plan that the worker might choose to follow, given the situation sketched in the vignette, or an interpretation of the situation presented. In addition, the trainee was asked to list reasons for his choice.

The case vignettes focused upon the following situations or questions: (1) suitability of play equipment; (2) request of licensed mother for help in handling a child's behavior problems; (3) an initial application in which the applicant seems suitable for day care but wants also at the same time to give nursing care to an aged, ill parent; (4) an applicant who shows personal characteristics which suggest emotional unsuitability for child care; (5) the efforts of a natural mother and day care mother to help a child move happily into day care; (6) the actions of a worker in handling a complaint against a licensed day care mother; and (7) a possible hazard to the physical safety of children.

---

[18] See Appendix A, pp. 24a-37, for a copy of the test and a description of the procedures followed in developing and scoring the test.

Findings from Situational Test.[19] This test was given to the trainees in each of the training groups six months after the end of the formal training. Fifty-seven per cent of the trainees taking the test achieved an overall score at or above the level set as minimal competence.

Trainees from Training Group I had the highest proportion of trainees who passed the total test -- 75 per cent. Trainees from Method III were next with 70 per cent of its trainees achieving at or above a level of minimal competence.

Trainees from State A, Training Method II, made a very poor showing on this test with only 11 per cent of its trainees passing the entire test. An inspection of test answers from this group suggested that in many cases the test was completed with a minimum involvement of time and effort. Apparently motivation to do well on the test was low, perhaps because the test was given at the end of the period of work following training and some of this group of trainees, as well as their supervisors, had little continuing interest in the project. In any case, it is quite possible that the results for State A do not reflect the potential of this group for performance on this test under other conditions.

---

[19] See Table 14, p. 197.

Further examination of Table 14 shows that, as a total group, trainees did least well on three items relating to peripheral tasks: Item 2 designed as a measure of knowledge about consultative help to a foster mother around the problems of a child in care, Item 5 which related to consultative aspects of work with natural parents, and Item 6 which dealt with the actions of a hypothetical worker in handling a complaint against a licensed foster mother. On this last item, involving the use of authority, only 29 per cent of the total group of trainees achieved at a level of minimal competence.

This test proved to be of considerable interest to trainees, experts, and supervisors. The trainees indicated that the test was interesting and stimulated them to further considerations of issues in licensing. Experts registered enthusiasm for the test and, by their written comments, revealed that a high level of thoughtful consideration had gone into their answers. Supervisors said that trainees frequently wanted to discuss the test in regular conferences as a means to further learning. A test of this nature might well be used as a teaching tool as well as testing device.

Summary of Situational Test results: Fifty-seven per cent of a total group of 37 trainees achieved an overall score at or above the level set as minimal competence on a test designed to appraise trainee's knowledge of appropriate worker activity in relation to licensing situations.

Trainees from Method I did best on this test with 75 per cent of its trainees achieving an overall score denoting a level of competence which would meet agency responsibility at least minimally. Trainees for Method III did nearly as well (70 per cent).

Trainees performed best on items relating to tasks contained in the application and study phase of licensing and least well on items relating to tasks of supervision-consultation and work with natural parents.

Evaluation of interviews: The evaluation measures reported so far have been indirect measures of performance. Therefore, an attempt was made to supplement these with a more direct, objective kind of evidence as to how the trainees performed some of the tasks for which they were trained. The area investigated was how well the trainees were able to carry out an initial interview with a new applicant for family home license.

Two techniques were used: one, a tape recorded experimental interview, an adaptation of role playing which has been used successfully by other researchers,[20] and the second, a tape recorded interview with an actual applicant for license. The experimental interview was used twice with trainees from Training Method I -- once at the end of the first two weeks of training and again at the end of the third week of training which followed an eight-weeks' work experience. The live interviews were obtained from trainees in Training Group III near the end of the six-months period of work experience following training. Obstacles of a practical nature precluded either kind of interview being carried out by States A and B of Training Group II.

---

[20] Edwin J. Thomas, Donna L. McLeod, and Lydia F. Hylton, "The Experimental Interview: A Technique for Studying Casework Performance," Social Work, July, 1960.

The purpose in securing and rating these interviews was two-fold: (1) to study and measure the ability of the trainee to perform adequately in an initial interview with a licensing applicant, and (2) to teach interviewing method.

The experimental interview: An exploratory use of this technique was carried out in the Pilot Demonstration and this provided a basis for its further use. Each time the interview was held, the trainee was asked to participate in an interview with an actress who would play the role of a family day care applicant. The trainee was given the following written instructions: "A woman has come into the office without an appointment and wants to see a worker about giving day care and getting a license. Since she has come in without an appointment and you have other work scheduled, you have approximately 45 minutes to spend with her. You know that your work load will permit additional interviews with her, as may be needed to complete a study. After you have concluded the interview, go to the library and make written notes, just as you would expect to do after interviews in your work situation. Include your impression and tentative evaluation."

The first and second interview situations were not the same, for the actress foster mother portrayed different personalities and behavior and had a different set of life circumstances and facts about herself which she revealed to the trainee when questioned appropriately. Because the two situations presented different types of problems at different levels of difficulty, a direct before-after comparison of the two interviews probably was not justified. Taken alone, however, each proved helpful in assessing the trainee's abilities in two different interviewing situations that were much like those he might encounter on the job.

A scale developed for rating the interviews had three sections covering: (1) content and purposes of an application interview; (2) the trainee's notes following the interview; and (3) interviewing techniques.[21]

Anchoring illustrations were written for the various levels on all items. A series of training sessions was conducted by a project staff member with two judges (social workers) who then rated each interview, working independently. Each rater judged the two series of interviews in a different sequence.[22]

In the first experimental interview, five of the eight trainees attained an overall minimally adequate score for all three categories: purposes, notes, and techniques. Two of these three who got lower scores failed in the category of notes, apparently due to anxiety in the test situation. In addition, two trainees obtained scores below minimal adequacy on interviewing techniques.

---

[21] See Appendix, pp. 38-52 for copy of the Rating Scale, anchoring illustrations, and scoring system.

[22] See Table 15, p. 198, for level of agreement between judges.

In the second experimental interview, all but one trainee achieved minimally adequate scores in all three categories. The one who failed to qualify fell below on interviewing techniques.[23]

These experimental interviews proved to be especially useful in evaluating the performance of trainees. They showed the group of trainees as a whole performing well above the level determined to be required for meeting agency responsibility minimally. This was interesting to us because there was some feeling among project staff that the interviews were very taxing to the trainees and that the level of competence aimed at, although relatively low numerically, was somewhat difficult to attain. Use of this technique was also valuable to the project staff in developing a rating scheme for the taped live interviews used with trainees from Training Group III.[24]

Live interviews: Nineteen of the 20 trainees in Training Group III submitted tape recordings of initial interviews with actual applicants for licenses to give child care.

Supervisors and trainees had been given the following instructions: The recorded interview should be with a new applicant for family home license, and carried out after the completion of the formal training by the supervisor; agency contact with the applicant should be kept at a minimum prior to the scheduled interview; any telephone screening or other contact prior to the interview in connection with the appointment should be recorded in writing so that the raters will know what the applicant had already told about herself or learned about licensing requirements.

---

[23] See Table 16, p. 199.

[24] See Progress Report, December 1, 1964, for additional discussion of the use of the Experimental Interview.

Supervisors and trainees did not see the scale on which interviews were to be rated. They were told, however, that the interview would be judged in relation to the tasks of the application phase of the licensing process, as these had been formulated in the course syllabus.

A rating scale[25] was developed similar to the one used earlier for evaluating the experimental interviews.

A series of training sessions was conducted by a project staff member with two outside judges (social workers), using tape recordings of interviews not included in the sample of interviews to be rated later. When agreement appeared to be adequate,[26] the judges then rated independently each interview in the sample of 19.

Ratings received by trainees[27] can be summarized as follows:

1. Trainees showed an ability to define objectives for an initial interview and to carry out the interview as planned.

2. Most of the trainees received a final score which was either within the range considered necessary to meet agency responsibility

---

[25] See Appendix A, pp. 53-61, for copy of the scale, anchoring illustrations, and scoring system.

[26] See Table 17, p. 200, for level of agreement between judges.

[27] See Table 18, p. 201.

minimally (seven trainees), or above this range of minimal competence (nine trainees). The remaining three trainees did not attain the level of minimal competence.

3. Over three-fourths of the trainees could perform adequately tasks 3, 4, and 5. These tasks included the ability to explore tentatively the motivation of the applicant, the capacity of the applicant to give child care, and the ability to clarify procedures and requirements of licensing.

4. All of the trainees could adequately lay a basis for a constructive working relationship with the applicant (task 6).

5. The task of interpreting what a standard is and testing the ability of the applicant to cooperate in meeting standards (task 2), offered some greater difficulty, but still 70 per cent of the trainees were able to perform this task adequately.

6. The first task -- that of giving an interpretation of the licensing law, its meaning and purpose, and the basis of the right of the state to license -- was most difficult for the trainees. Only eight of the 19 trainees performed this task at a level which would meet agency responsibility minimally.

The performance of the group of trainees in the recorded interviews was generally satisfactory. In a considerable number of instances it was above the level which would meet agency responsibility minimally.

It is noteworthy that these nonprofessional staff members could perform, not only the fact-finding or information-giving tasks, but also those tasks which require an ability to explore, at least tentatively, an applicant's feelings and experiences, and to offer warmth and acceptance to the applicant.

It is significant, however, that less than half of the trainees could explain adequately the meaning and purpose of the licensing law. It may be that this task involved a use of authority which, if used well, needed to be based on a degree of assuredness about one's right to "require" and "prohibit." This is a quality which is not easy to acquire, either because of personal feelings about "authority," "intervention," "requirements," or perhaps because one lacks an adequate framework of knowledge about the law and its purpose. In any case, it was clear that this task in the licensing process was a more difficult one than had been recognized; special attention, therefore, should be given to help staff persons establish or improve their ability in this important area.

Another suggested reason for the inability of many of the trainees to perform this task was that they were not clear about the particular function being performed. This inference was supported by the fact that six of the 11 trainees who could not interpret the licensing law also could not interpret what a standard was, and test the readiness of the applicant to cooperate in meeting standards. Five of these six trainees were workers in agency settings where they carried a diversified case load, and were interviewing an applicant who, if licensed, would later accept agency children in placement. Although these trainees were not the placement workers for these particular homes, the possibility of confusion about function, role, and specific requirements probably was greater than in a situation where the trainee was assigned only to licensing responsibilities.

One of the rewarding aspects of this evaluation procedure was the extent to which public welfare staff was ready to cooperate in meeting the requirements which project staff believed important to a sound evaluation. When a request for these interviews was first made to state liaisons and supervisors, it was met with considerable resistance and concern. This was intensified by the fact that project staff had no way to provide recording equipment to the various offices in the nine participating states. This meant that the public welfare personnel concerned were being asked to work through varying degrees of resistance which they anticipated from administrators, trainees, and applicants and also to buy or borrow recording equipment. The fact that 19 of the 20 trainees were able to complete this interview has been gratifying. It suggested that this means of evaluation of worker performance might be used more widely in other public welfare settings.

A final word should be said about the usefulness of the tape recorded interviews for teaching. Each trainee who participated in the experimental interview was later given a transcript of each of his interviews for study and discussion with a project staff member. Trainees found this of great interest and participated well in this kind of teaching session. In Teaching Method III, the trainees in most instances recorded more than one interview before submitting one for evaluation. Supervisors and trainees studied these in conference as a basis for further learning.

Several trainees, as well as supervisors, wrote that this technique provided one of the best learning experiences of the project.

The use of the worker's own tape recorded interviews as a teaching device has been little used in social work, and offers considerable promise in future training programs.

Summary of evaluation of interviews: Two techniques were used to investigate the extent to which the trainees were able successfully to conduct an initial interview with a new applicant for family home license. An experimental tape recorded interview was carried out twice with trainees from Training Group I; trainees from Training Group III submitted tape recorded interviews with actual applicants for license. All these interviews were then rated by two independent judges.

Each group of trainees, as a whole, performed well above the level required for meeting agency responsibility minimally. Two tasks presented difficulties to the trainees: interpreting licensing procedures (Group I) and interpreting the licensing law (Group III).

Evaluation of case records: Two reasons led the project staff to include an analysis of the trainees' case records in the evaluation procedures for each demonstration, even though no emphasis had been placed on teaching recording during the training sessions. First, a rating of records which had been prepared by trainees in their individual work situations represented an obvious and practical method of direct evaluation of trainee performance. These records had been prepared in the course of the trainees' everyday work, with little or no regard for special project requirements; and agency supervisors had accepted them as official accounts of case activity. Therefore, such records, when used as a sample of recording per se, constituted a basis for a direct measure of actual worker performance (in this case, recording performance).

The second reason for analyzing trainees' case records related to the special importance of the written record in licensing practice. The record becomes the agency's proof that it should or should not grant a license in a given situation. Because of the statutory basis of the licensing function, the social evidence of the applicant's qualification for a license should be fully and accurately recorded. The written record, then, should provide the facts and the evaluation of these facts that form the basis for the summary judgment to recommend for or against issuance of license.

The scale devised for scoring the records[28] dealt with the content of the record in 12 categories of information appropriate to a family home licensing record. Each of the 39 items contained in these 12 categories was rated on a five point scale for completeness or adequacy of information presented that was appropriate to the particular home study.

---

[28] See Appendix A, pp. 83-99, for copy of the Rating Scale and anchoring illustrations. Techniques of recording were also rated, but since this part of the analysis added no additional insights about trainees' performance, it is not being reported.

The level of acceptable competence was determined by a panel of experts, according to a procedure previously reported.[29] The results of these determinations produced a set of scores, one for each item, that indicated the level of performance considered by the experts to be adequate for meeting agency responsibility minimally.

The selection of records to be rated presented some problems. As one of the requirements for participation in the project, supervisors of the trainees in the first demonstration (Training Method I) were asked to submit 20 case records (initial licensing studies) which the trainee had completed during the six months of work experience following the last training session. It was planned to select at random five studies from each trainee's pool of 20 and to rate those records. This number of completed studies had seemed to the project staff to be a reasonable request, but it proved to be impossible to attain, except for two of the trainees. As a result of interfering conditions within the agency, the number of completed records submitted ranged from one to 22 per trainee with an average number of 11.

Since it was not possible to select case records at random for rating from an equal number for each trainee, an alternative procedure was used. A project staff member reviewed all the records submitted and made a selection of five cases for each trainee (except for the trainee for whom only one record was submitted) which, in his opinion, were the best examples of recording practice submitted by that particular trainee.

---

[29] See pp. 11-28.

Considerable correspondence and telephone exchange of information between project staff, trainees' supervisors, and state liaisons led us to believe that the records submitted by supervisors were all of the records of initial licensing studies that the agency had available to submit for a particular trainee. Therefore, this selection for rating constituted a sample of trainees' best records from his total licensing experience during the project time period.

In our planning discussions for Training Method II and III held with state liaisons and supervisors, again the opinion was expressed that 20 case records per trainee would be an impractical requirement to apply to all. Therefore, supervisors of trainees in Training Method II and III were asked to submit, for evaluation, three case records of initial licensing studies. These three records were to be selected by the supervisor as representing the trainee's best recording.

In spite of the necessary adaptations from the original design, the resulting selection of records for rating appeared to have been on a reasonably comparable basis for all trainees. Our correspondence and discussions with agency personnel also led us to believe that the records selected for rating were typical of agency recording practice.

A series of training sessions was conducted by a project staff member with two judges (social workers) using anchoring illustrations and case records that were excluded from the sample to be rated. Following training, each judge worked independently to apply the rating scale to each of the records in the selected sample.[30]

Evaluation of case record results: The overall recording performance of the trainees, in relation to the standard set by the experts, was poor for all the trainee groups. Perhaps the most telling fact is that not one of the trainees attained an overall score representing minimally adequate performance. Furthermore, it can be seen from Table 20[31] that for only three categories, (Summary of Case Activity, Request for Service, and Material from References) did at least half of the trainees in two groups -- Group I and State A of Group II -- achieve a level of competence at or above the level set by experts.

In view of these results, let us look at the kinds of information included in the categories which were treated more adequately in the recording. Summary of Case Activity included the dates of interviews, names of interviewees, place of interviews, and whether these were in person or by telephone.

Request for Service was focused on the source of referral, whether the applicant wanted to give day care or full-time care, the age, number, and special characteristics of children she wanted to give care to, what the applicant already knew about licensing, and her reasons for wanting to give a child care service.

---

[30] See Table 19, p. 203, for level of interjudge agreement.

[31] See Table 20, p. 204, for achievement of trainee groups on the various categories of record content. See Table 21, p. 206, for ratings of trainee groups on the various items within categories.

Material from References dealt with the relationship of the applicant to the reference person and a summary and evaluation of the information received about the applicant's ability to care for children.

It was apparent that the categories which received highest ratings were ones that could be adequately answered briefly from available facts requiring little evaluation. This was in contrast to a more demanding category such as Description of Foster Family as a Whole. Furthermore, the content receiving highest ratings is frequently included in many social work records, regardless of the nature of the social work service. Possibly this was why there was a sufficient degree of agreement between trainees, supervisors, and experts that the level of recording which satisfied the supervisors also satisfied the experts.

Project staff raised the question as to whether experts and agency personnel actually might be in agreement as to the categories of information which should be emphasized or more fully treated in a licensing study record. This could be, even though trainees' performance in recording those categories of information fell below the standard set by experts. To answer this question, a rank correlation (Spearman's Rho) between experts' weightings for the 12 categories and trainees' raw scores for those categories was computed. This procedure was carried out for each of the three Training Method groups. The computations yielded coefficients of -.31 (Group I), -.19 (State A), and -.13 (Group III). None of these was significant.

Having found no relationship between trainees' and experts' choice of content to emphasize or treat most adequately in recording, it was predicted that trainee groups would make similar choices to each other. Another correlational analysis (Rho) was carried out to discover what relationship there was among trainee groups in their emphasis on categories of recording content. The correlation between the average raw scores of Group I and Group III was .85 ($p. < .01$). State A did not correlate as highly with Groups I and III (State A and Group I, .49, $.10 > p < .05$, State A and Group III, .58, $p < .05$) because the scores of the State A trainees were on the whole, higher than scores of trainees from Groups I and III, although there was a wide range of variation within State A. Some of the State A records contained fuller descriptions and showed more effective attempts to individualize persons and situations.

In general, recording was better when "out of the ordinary" situations were dealt with. In such records, there was often more spontaneity in written expression and more individualization of the applicant and her situation. The chief problems in the recordings were the sparsity of information and the tendency to stereotype so that even the information given was of questionable value.

The question arose as to whether the trainees' poor showing in the record writing meant that the general level of their total activity in carrying out the licensing function was unacceptable. This does not appear to be the case, since on other evaluative measures, the groups of the trainees showed attainment at or above the level of competence considered necessary for meeting agency responsibility. Furthermore, it must be remembered that this scale was a measure of performance as recorders, and serious question can be raised about an assumption that recording in any field of practice is a totally accurate or complete reflection of worker activity.

Nevertheless, there was cause for considerable concern, if for no other reason than the importance of the record in licensing practice. Considering the low overall trainee scores, it was difficult to see how these records could fulfill the administrative function of serving as documentation of the basis for agency decision to issue or deny a child care license.

Why should recording performance be below standard when trainees showed adequate performance on other measures? Were there factors inherent in the nature of the tasks and/or social agency organization that contributed to or reinforced poor recording practice? Our somewhat rough time-allocation data for Training Method I indicated that recording consumed by far the greatest block of the trainees' working time -- more than twice as much as that spent in contact with clients. Why, in spite of this amount of time devoted to the task was the recording not better?

One reason, relating to the nature of the task, may be that recording is one of the hardest skills the worker is asked to learn. The effective use of written language is an acquired skill. In social work, recording requires an ability to select from numerous observations and verbal exchanges the pertinent examples that lead to an evaluation or opinion, the ability to organize ideas into relevant categories, and to convey these ideas clearly and accurately in written words.

Educators and parents have voiced considerable dissatisfaction with the results of early academic instruction in the use of English, particularly as reflected in written assignments. College teachers have frequent occasion to be dismayed by the inability of large numbers of students to organize ideas and convey them in writing in a clear, logical manner. Perhaps, to a limited extent, some of the low level of recording performance shown by these trainees was simply another example of widespread inability to use the written language effectively.

Another reason to be considered is that this group of trainees received insufficient help in the learning of recording skills. Recording per se was not taught during the training sessions. Attention was given to the importance of the record -- the purpose it serves in licensing practice -- but the "how" of recording was not taught, except for some brief opportunities for practice in recording what the trainee had done or observed in role playing situations. This was apparently insufficient practice to have impact on recording performance on the job. The decision to teach recording in this very limited way was a difficult one for the project staff, for they were convinced of the importance of the record and aware of the frustrations posed to both worker and supervisor around the task of recording. The decision was due to the limited training time, the priority attached to teaching the basic principles of the licensing process, and the conclusion that the acquisition of recording skills was more appropriately reserved for on-the-job learning.

It is true, however, that child welfare supervisors have many demanding responsibilities and, realistically, do not have sufficient time to give the careful, tutorial kind of teaching required to help an individual improve his skill in writing. Workers are frequently expected to master the tasks of recording from an outline or guide and from the example of other agency records that come to their attention, many of which do not portray good practice in recording.

Another consideration which may help to account for the low level of trainee attainment in recording relates to the general concern and dissatisfaction in the social work field about recording. The concern is general and very real. It is reflected in the literature[32] and in the complaints of administrators, supervisors, and workers. Each of the trainees at different times expressed dissatisfaction with recording requirements and the wish for more attention to this problem, as had supervisors in both the Pilot Demonstration and the three training groups here reported.

Finally, it should be noted that the scoring system was devised by experts in the field, based on what they considered necessary for adequate recording. It may be that their ideas were more consistent with theoretical considerations of the requirements for an adequate licensing study record than with actual practice in agencies.

---

[32] John Frings, "Experimental Systems of Recording," Social Casework, XXXVIII, No. 2 (February, 1957), pp. 55-63.

Reuben Pannor and Marian V. Peterson, "Current Trends in Case Recording," Child Welfare, XLII, No. 5 (May, 1963), pp. 230-234.

Sarah Stone and Edith N. Kerschner, "Creative Recording," Child Welfare, XXXVIII, No. 1 (January, 1959), pp. 1-8.

Summary of case record evaluation: The recording performance of trainees from all demonstration groups was assessed by two independent judges who applied a rating scale to trainees' case records of initial licensing studies. Ratings were measured against a level of competence which met agency responsibility minimally. This competence level was defined by a panel of experts. Trainees' recording performance for all training groups was below the minimal competence level.

Explanations for this finding appear to lie in a number of factors: The skills involved in recording are difficult ones to acquire; these skills were not taught in the training sessions, nor were agencies especially urged to give attention to helping trainees learn these skills on the job; the traditional recording procedures of the agencies provided a sterile model for trainees to follow; and experts apparently set a theoretical standard different from practice expectations, illustrating the confusion in the field about the purpose and nature of social work recording.

Additional Aspects of Trainee Performance

We turn now to an examination of some additional insights about trainee performance in the tasks of licensing family homes. These observations were gained from certain descriptive and qualitative assessments. The method for this appraisal has been (1) an examination of trainee performance on certain specific items of the previously reported evaluation instruments, and (2) an assessment by project staff of the content and quality of worker activity as reflected in a group of case records. These case records were submitted by trainees to illustrate specific aspects of their activity and, therefore, were not a part of the record evaluation of initial licensing studies already reported. Instead, they were additional records showing examples of supervision-consultation to a licensee, community organization tasks of licensing, relicensing studies, and accounts of withdrawals of the applicant or denials of license.

Findings about trainee performance from this kind of appraisal rest less on a quantitative and strictly objective assessment than do the procedures previously reported. Nevertheless, the findings were gathered systematically and evaluative judgments by project staff were made as impartially and consistently as possible. In spite of some limitations of the method, the results of the appraisal appeared to offer further insights into the ability of nonprofessional workers and provided a useful extension to the findings already reported.

Supervision-Consultation: It is clear that in practice, supervision-consultation is not accorded a place of central importance in the hierarchy of tasks within the licensing of family homes.[33] This was first indicated in the early identification of tasks which was our first step in the analysis of the content of the licensing function.[34] Results showed that supervision-consultation to the licensed foster mother was rated low in importance compared to such tasks as making a home investigation, interpreting regulations, evaluating the results of the study, and making a recommendation for or against licensing.

This indication of the low order of importance attached to supervision-consultation was reinforced with the next step in the project -- the use of opinions of a group of experts to define a level of competence.[35] The value pattern on which there was highest agreement among experts showed that relatively low importance was assigned to supervision-consultation to the licensee. In other words, experts said that for agency responsibility to be met minimally, the worker does not need to be able to carry out supervision of the licensed foster mother or consultation to her as well or as often as he must do the first steps in the licensing process.

---

[33] Supervision of the licensee implies worker activity, primarily with the licensed foster mother, to assure that there is a continuance of the meeting of agency requirements, or standards. As such, it is a part of the licensing process. It is thus distinguished from the usual meaning of supervision in social work, as an administrative activity between worker and agency supervisor to assure that agency responsibility is met as fully as possible. Furthermore, it is different than supervision of the child in the foster home where the agency has continuing responsibility for the care of the child.

Consultation in licensing, as herein used, means activity on the part of the licensing worker to teach the foster mother and enable her to attempt a better way of caring for children. It is thus distinguished from consultation in social work which involves activity between persons who have joint responsibility for some case or other professional activity and who collaborate to solve work problems.

[34] See Chapter 1, p. 9.

[35] See Chapter 1, p. 11.

It should be noted, however, that experts had been asked to make judgments in relation to a minimal standard of competence. Had they been asked to rate the importance of tasks in relation to an optimal standard, they might have given higher importance to supervision-consultation. This is not certain, however, since the 96 social workers who participated in the early identification of tasks also assigned relatively low ratings to supervision-consultation. These social workers had been asked only to rate the tasks according to their relative importance to the licensing function, a more open instruction which probably led raters to make their judgments in the direction of "desirable" or "optimal" practice.

In any case, it is apparent that there is some disparity in the order of importance assigned to supervision-consultation in the licensing of family homes. This disparity is most evident between what is expected or seen as possible in the practice setting, and the position of project staff and others[36] as to the importance of supervision-consultation to a high level of practice, essential to the attainment of the goals of licensing.

This difference raised questions such as the following: Does the relatively low order of importance assigned in practice to supervision-consultation of family homes come about because most social workers do not accept the essential nature of supervision-consultation to the attainment of goals in licensing? Or, is it more directly explained and justified by the pressures to use limited staff resources for other functions? Or, may it simply reflect a lack of understanding as to "What is supervision-consultation" of family homes in child welfare and how is it like and unlike casework services to children and families? Such a lack of clarity about the nature of the tasks in questions could certainly influence supervisors and workers to spend their busy work hours on other more clearly defined tasks. On the other hand, perhaps this difference in emphasis is simply a reflection of doubts of administrators and supervisors that nonprofessional persons can successfully carry out supervision-consultation to licensees, i.e., foster mothers with children in care. Faced with such doubts, there might not be encouragement or expectation in the agency setting that supervision-consultation should be a part of a total program of licensing.

---

[36] American Public Welfare Association, "Public Welfare Responsibility for Child Care Licensing," Public Welfare, XXI (April, 1963), p. 36.

These kinds of unanswered questions led project staff to scrutinize the evidence at hand as to the results of nonprofessional trainees' efforts to carry out the tasks of supervision-consultation of family homes. Could most of the nonprofessional workers perform these tasks? What in the evidence was a result of the capabilities of nonprofessional persons and what was more essentially a reflection of agency expectations based on traditional practice?

Three measures were used to assess, at least partially, the performance of nonprofessional trainees in relation to the supervision-consultation tasks of licensing. These measures were as follows: (1) a cluster of items in the Supervisory Rating Scale; (2) two test items in the Situational Test; and (3) case records submitted by trainees to show their activity in the tasks of supervision-consultation. Results from these measures can be summarized as follows:

Supervisors' ratings of trainees' performance on supervision-consultation: Supervisors, generally, were satisfied as to their trainees' performance of supervision-consultation tasks. On those tasks where their trainees had had opportunity for experience, supervisors gave ratings generally above the level which workers must attain to meet agency responsibility minimally. Most trainees had opportunities to perform the tasks in giving advice or suggestions to applicants or licensees around specific problems related to independent foster care, or tasks involved in using other agencies and community resources in behalf of licensees. Less than half of the trainees had opportunities in their work experience to perform tasks involved in rejecting a home at the time of the relicensing study, or to handle complaint situations, i.e., assess motivation of the complainant and the plausibility of the charge, to discuss the complaint with the complainant and the licensee with honesty and tactfulness. When trainees did have this experience, supervisors again were generally satisfied with their performance.

Trainees' achievement on supervision-consultation items of Situational Test: Test item 2 was designed as a measure of a trainee's judgment in relation to giving consultative help to a foster mother around the problems of a child in care. On this item, 58 per cent of the trainees achieved a score indicating ability to meet agency responsibility at or above a minimal level. While it cannot be stated with certainty that this item contained the same level of difficulty as all other items of the test, it is still worth noting that the percentage of success on this item dealing with peripheral tasks was considerably below the trainees' performance on each of the other items of the Situational Test which dealt with the central steps of licensing.

Test item 6 dealt with the actions of a hypothetical worker in handling a complaint against a licensed foster mother. Just 29 per cent of the trainees achieved at a level of minimal adequacy on this item involving the use of authority. Project staff viewed this item as clearly written, involving straight-forward judgments, and yet almost three-fourths of the trainees could not correctly assess the worker's activity in the case vignette.

Supervision-consultation case records: Thirty-two of the 41 trainees (78 per cent) submitted case records as examples of their work in supervision-consultation. A project staff member read and evaluated these records with attention to content of the worker's activity and its quality.

The staff member's notes on each record were then reviewed by other staff members as a check on judgments.

Although supervisors had been satisfied with workers' performance on tasks of supervision-consultation in those areas where workers had opportunity for experience, the evaluation of case records did not wholeheartedly support the assumption that the nonprofessional worker can or cannot do these tasks. Results were as follows:

A. Sixteen of the 32 trainees (50 per cent) who sent case records showed activity in the tasks of supervision-consultation which was judged to be at or above a level which would meet agency responsibility minimally.

The content of this successful activity fell into two main categories: (1) supervisory help entailing some use of authority, and (2) consultation to raise the level of child care.

The supervisory help was for the purposes of (a) helping the marginal applicant to decide whether she should withdraw her application or endeavor to conform to requirements; (b) helping the applicant to understand and meet mandatory requirements; (c) holding the licensee to conformity; and (d) handling complaints against a licensee.

The consultative help was in terms of (a) helping the applicant to understand and meet mandatory requirements; (b) helping the licensee to meet recommended standards; (c) referral to other community agencies for problems of a child in care; and (d) help to or in behalf of natural parents.[37]

---

[37] See Appendix I, p. 151, for brief descriptions of trainees' activity which shows the variety and usefulness of these services.

B. In spite of these positive findings, 16 out of 32 trainees (50 per cent) submitted records which were judged to be below a level which would meet agency responsibility minimally. Some of these unacceptable records contained examples of supervisory help meant to hold a licensee to conformity or showed efforts to handle a complaint situation. The majority of these unacceptable case examples, however, were judged to be below a level of minimal adequacy because the records contained only nominal recording which did not lend itself to evaluation. Sometimes problems which were suggested as implicit in the situation were ignored and worker activity remained unclear. It must be pointed out that when records were judged as below a level of minimal adequacy, it was not always certain as to whether this was due to a lack of ability on the part of the worker or whether it related more directly to a lack of agency expectation that the tasks would be done.

C. When records of the various trainees in the different training groups were compared, it was apparent that workers who were trained by their supervisors produced better records to show supervision-consultation activity than did workers in the other training groups. Ten of the 18 workers who submitted records showed activity which was acceptable and six of these produced records which showed supervision-consultation which was clearly above a level which would meet agency responsibility only minimally. This was in contrast to the other groups whose best records qualified as just minimally adequate.

Why should this difference exist? Possibly because the supervisors of these workers had a better chance to learn the nature of supervision-consultation than did supervisors of trainees in the other training groups. Project staff had recognized the general lack of understanding as to the nature of the tasks contained in this part of the licensing process and prepared a working paper to make these tasks more explicit. This paper was ready for use with supervisors who trained their own workers, but not ready for use earlier with other training groups. Supervisors of social work personnel, and particularly supervisors of nonprofessional persons, have a determining influence on the degree of importance which the worker attaches to various parts of his assignment, and the actual level of performance which the worker is able to maintain. These supervisors who had a better chance to understand the nature of supervision-consultation in licensing and its importance to the goals of a licensing program probably taught and expected a better level of practice in this part of the worker's assignment.

Conclusions about supervision-consultation tasks: Supervisors, rating their trainees' performance in the area of supervision-consultation, indicated, in general, that they were satisfied that their trainees performed at or above the level set by experts as essential to meeting agency responsibility minimally. At the same time, for a number of tasks of supervision-consultation supervisors indicated that their trainees had no experience during the project period. This might suggest that these tasks were indeed often overlooked or dispensed with when there were pressures for other uses of staff. It is noteworthy, however, that when trainees performed tasks of supervision-consultation, their supervisors indicated that these were done well.

It appeared evident that a difficult area for trainees lay in the use of authority -- denying a license at time of relicensing, handling complaint situations, holding old offenders to conformity. Nevertheless, some of the case records which were submitted contained examples of effective practice in these areas.

While the question as to whether nonprofessional persons can successfully perform the tasks of supervision-consultation cannot be answered from our data without some qualification, it was evident that they can give satisfaction to supervisors in their performance of these tasks. Furthermore, the fact that a substantial number of records showed successful performance of these tasks in a variety of case situations reinforces the opinion that nonprofessional persons can be taught to perform the tasks effectively. Much appears to depend upon the expectations of the agency, the agency supervisor, and the norms set in the agency practice setting.

Relicensing studies: There are different ways of viewing agency responsibility when a license is due to be reissued or revalidated. One view is that once the agency has made an initial study of the home, established conformity of the applicant and issued license, then its future responsibility is only to establish and document nonconformity of the licensee if and when it appears. This view considerably limits the responsibility of the worker, and permits a fairly perfunctory role.

Another view gives the licensing worker more responsibility and opportunity to use the licensing authority to its full potential for children. This view holds that the worker conducts a relicensing study, i.e., not only determines if standards continue to be met, but also assesses the changes in the licensee's situation and the child care service and offers consultative help to the licensee to increase her capability in child care. This latter view was incorporated into the curriculum materials used in the training sessions.

Supervisory ratings of relicensing tasks: As has been described earlier,[38] agency supervisors registered a high degree of satisfaction with trainees' overall performance. This general satisfaction prevailed on items having to do specifically with the relicensing study, showing the trainees' ability to review changes in the home and the pattern of child care and to re-evaluate strengths and weaknesses in relation to standards. Relatively less satisfaction was reflected in the trainees' ability to reject a home at the time of relicensing if it seemed warranted.

Case records of relicensing studies: Each trainee was asked to submit three records showing his activity in re-evaluating a family home for reissuance or revalidation of a license. All but nine (seven from

---

[38] See pp. 68-74.

State A and two from Group III) of the 41 trainees (78 per cent) submitted such records. These nine trainees were working in communities where the licensing law was being newly implemented. Therefore, no opportunities arose for relicensing studies during the project time period.

The records were then read and evaluated by a project staff member with attention to the type and quality of worker activity and whether the content justified the recommendation for relicense. This staff member's notes were then discussed and reviewed by another staff member as a check on judgment.

As a result of the review of case records, certain observations can be made about trainees' performance of the tasks connected with relicensing studies.

1. In the majority of records submitted, the trainees had evaluated homes in which they had had no previous contact. In addition, 80 per cent of the records showed that the re-evaluation was completed in one visit. Such practice suggested that it was probably unrealistic to expect that under these circumstances the trainee could determine if standards continue to be met, assess changes in the family home situation and the child care service, and offer consultative help to raise the level of child care.

2. The majority of the records reflected the trainees' abilities to make concrete determinations related to basic identifying information, physical changes in the home or person, its present population, and some observations of the children during the visit. All records contained the

recommendation for license, specifying the number of children and the type of care, i.e., day care or full time. In general, the records seemed to be a documentation of the existing situation in its concrete, directly observable characteristics.

3. There was little major evidence of trainees' ability to deal in depth with the quality of child care, to identify problem areas, and to determine future plans with the licensee. The concerns which the trainees felt, e.g., personality or health disturbances, frequently were expressed in the record, but without coming to a sound diagnosis or plan of action. In one instance, a trainee's documentation of a severe character malfunctioning stood alongside the recommendation for license. Whether the trainee was unable to understand the meaning for children of the licensee's behavior, or believed for various possible reasons that he did not have the alternative of recommending against reissuance of license, is not clear.

4. There was considerable variation in the records which reflected not only differences in trainees' abilities, but also differences in agency practice and expectation for performance. There were only a few trainees who submitted relicensing studies which showed that the agency expectation was for the relicensing procedures to be used as a catalyst for improved child care. In general, the agency expectation appeared to be for the relicensing study to serve as an indication that standards continued to be met and a license, therefore, could be reissued.

Two factors were probably involved in these findings. One was the obvious one of heavy work loads in public welfare, which often necessitate shortcuts to modified goals. The other was the generally unrecognized or unaccepted use of the relicensing procedures for improving a level of care for children.

Trainees' use of authority in unsatisfactory situations: Running through the preceding account of the results of evaluation measures were indications that trainees had difficulty in the successful use of authority. An overall examination of these separate indications was made to determine more clearly the extent to which trainees experienced such difficulty and to identify some of the factors involved.

These were the evidences of trainees' difficulty in the successful use of authority:

1. An inspection of trainee scores on an item of the Supervisory Rating Scale, "Is the trainee able to use authority when necessary with the applicant or licensee?", showed that 63 per cent of the trainees performed the task at or above a level of minimal competence. This percentage encompassed a majority of the trainees; however, it was significant that the supervisors indicated that over a third of the trainees could not use authority successfully with the applicant or licensee.

Further examination of results from the Supervisory Rating Scale showed that among all the peripheral tasks, trainees did least well on a set of tasks contained in the Recommendation category. These tasks had to do with handling situations where the home is not licensable, rejecting a home at the time of relicensing, and offering the applicant opportunity to withdraw without damage from the rejection.

2. When asked to list areas in which their trainees had needed most help, supervisors from all training groups indicated that trainees had needed considerable help in establishing relationships. This answer was often further specified as "how to use authority," or "how to alleviate resistance to licensing on the part of the applicant."

3. The evaluation of the live initial interviews which had been conducted by trainees in Training Method III showed that less than half of the trainees were able to explain adequately the meaning and purpose of the licensing law. While carrying out an initial interview with a new applicant was not dealing with "an unsatisfactory situation," nevertheless interpreting and representing the licensing law required the worker to assume some stance of authority, based on an acceptance of one's right and responsibility to "require" and "prohibit."

4. Item 6 of the Situational Test dealt with proper means of handling a complaint situation. Only 29 per cent of the total group of trainees who completed this test answered this item at a level denoting at least minimal competence.

5. While some examples of effective practice in supervision of a licensee were contained in the supervision-consultation records submitted by trainees, in general, it was difficult for trainees to deny a license at time of restudy of the home, handle complaint situations, and to hold old offenders to conformity.

6. The appraisal of the relicensing records reinforced the conclusions drawn from the supervision-consultation records and pointed up the interrelationship between the trainee's ability to use authority at the time of relicensing and his capability in the area of giving supervision-consultation.[39]

7. An additional evaluation of case records (those showing denial of a license) was made which has not been previously reported. These evaluations were made by project staff members in the same manner as was done for the supervision-consultation and relicensing records. Two findings stand out:

a. Trainees were able more frequently to use the authority required to deny a license when it was done with a new applicant; much more difficulty was encountered at the point of a relicensing study. If the agency had once sanctioned the child care service, then the trainee had difficulty in the use of authority even though standards no longer were met by the licensee.

---

[39] For example, all licensing workers are familiar with troubling situations where the decision is made to relicense a borderline home because there appears to be no clearly demonstrated inability to meet standards which can be used as a basis for denial of license. The licensing of such borderline homes is sometimes justified on the basis that the agency then has "a foot in the door," and will know what is happening to children in that home. This is constructive only if the worker then moves to exercise his authority in planned supervisory visits. This does not mean visits just for purposes of observations, and "knowing what is going on." There must be a continuing, active interpretation to the licensee of the meaning of standards and the necessity that these standards be clearly and consistently met. In other words, the question as to whether the agency is discharging its responsibility in such "gray" cases depends upon the extent to which the worker is setting goals with the licensee within reasonable time limits, and it can be shown that the licensee is moving toward a better standard of child care and a more clearly recognized meeting of standards.

b. Almost half of the trainees (19) submitted at least one record which showed denial of a license to a new applicant. Trainees showed ability to formulate a judgment against issuance of a license and to convey this decision to the applicant when the judgments were related to the applicant's ability to meet certain *tangible* standards. No examples were offered among the case records of the use of authority when intangible standards were involved, e.g., personality problems or troubled situations among family members which would negate good care to foster children.

What are the conclusions or implications to be drawn from these findings? It was evident that some of the nonprofessional trainees were able to use authority successfully. But for a substantial number, it was a problem area.

Clearly implied, then, is the need for additional learning opportunities to the nonprofessional staff person concerning the nature and use of authority. These additional opportunities should occur both in formal training sessions and in increased and continuing supervisory help on the job.[40]

---

[40] It is interesting that at least one of the Training Groups (III) focused less on standards and standards application than on other topics in the syllabus (see p. 58). While there are many facets to the successful use of authority, certainly the worker is better prepared if he possesses a thorough knowledge of the mandatory requirements of his state, has at hand a realistic rationale for each of the requirements, and has incorporated unto himself a comfortable degree of acceptance of his responsibility to require these specific conditions. The worker is aided in acquiring these characteristics through self-study and discussion with his supervisor.

A second implication from these findings is that, to a considerable extent, the nonprofessional person's competence in the use of authority will depend upon agency expectations and support. Supervisors and administrators must be clear about the authority entailed in a licensing program and the ways in which this authority can be successfully and consistently presented. In addition, there must be total attention to the licensing program, that is, recognition of the interrelationship between good or poor practice in all phases of the licensing process.

A third implication is in relation to the use of authority in other settings where nonprofessional staff persons are used. As Beck has pointed out in a discussion of school social work, "At one time we saw authority -- particularly legal authority -- as something alien to social work process. . . . Today we recognize that some element of authority is inherent in every social work relationship so that it is not possible to carry on social work practice without handling the opportunities presented by having an authoritative role."[41] In view of this statement, attention should be given to staff competence in the presentation of authority in the numerous other social welfare settings where nonprofessional staff persons are used.

The extent to which the nonprofessional person can develop his capabilities in the presentation of authority may depend in large part on the clarity around this issue in a particular agency and the opportunities for support and learning which are provided him.

---

[41] Bertram M. Beck, "School Social Work: An Instrument of Education," Social Work, IV, No. 4 (October, 1959), p. 90.

Community organization tasks: In considering the attention which should be given to community organization aspects of the licensing function in the curriculum materials, the project staff agreed on two premises: (1) that community organization tasks in licensing are essential to a sound, continuous program of licensing; and (2) that the nonprofessional staff person can be enabled to assume an effective role in this part of the licensing responsibility.

It is interesting that in the identification of tasks early in the project, social workers rated the tasks having to do with community organization aspects of licensing as having less importance than all the other tasks.[42] Furthermore, four of the six tasks of community organization offered for rating were termed "inappropriate" by ten per cent or more of the respondents. Persons using the "inappropriate" category sometimes included written comments to the effect that they did not mean the task was unimportant, but that it was not suitable for the licensing worker, and should be reserved for higher echelon staff -- supervisors and administrators. It seemed feasible to infer from this that these tasks were seen by such respondents as somewhat more difficult -- tasks that could not safely be left to the worker, and perhaps particularly to the nonprofessional worker.

---

[42] See p. 11.

The indication of low priority for community organization tasks of licensing, at least as an assignment for the licensing worker, was reinforced by the opinions of the group of experts who defined the level of competence used in the project. The experts assigned relatively low importance to the community organization tasks of a licensing program, i.e., they said that for agency responsibility to be met minimally, the worker does not need to be able to carry out community organization tasks of licensing as well or as often as he must do the central steps in the licensing process.

The first measure of the extent to which nonprofessional persons can successfully perform the community organization tasks of licensing came from the Supervisory Rating Scale. Supervisors, given an opportunity to rate their trainees' performance, generally indicated satisfaction with it. On those tasks where their trainees had opportunity for experience, supervisors gave ratings generally above the level which workers must attain to meet agency responsibility minimally. However, supervisors indicated that 43 per cent of the trainees had had no opportunity to carry out the quite specific tasks listed on the Supervisory Rating Scale and answered that they had no basis for judgment in relation to these particular tasks.

Therefore, the written accounts submitted by trainees with their supervisors' approval were examined for further indications of trainees' ability to carry out some of the community organization tasks in a licensing program. Thirty of the 41 trainees (73 per cent) submitted accounts of one or more community experiences in licensing. A project staff member read and systematically evaluated these reports with attention to (1) the content of the experience and its relationship to the agency's licensing program, and (2) the quality of the work as reflected in the written account. The staff member's notes on each report were then reviewed by another staff member as a check on judgment.

Twenty-five of the 30 trainees (83 per cent) who sent written reports showed activity in the community organization tasks of licensing which was judged to be at or above a level which would meet agency responsibility minimally. The written reports described varied experiences and showed the readiness of these trainees to involve themselves in an interpretation of licensing and to relate licensing to the broader concerns in child welfare.

The range of experiences included (1) interpretation of licensing to colleagues through informal coffee breaks as well as formal presentations at staff meetings and, in one instance, to a state orientation meeting for beginning child welfare staff; (2) interpretation of some facet of licensing to representatives of other governmental administrative and regulatory agencies with emphasis upon the common interests and goals of both agencies; (3) interpretation to staff and board of other social agencies of the protective element in licensing and the common interests shared by voluntary child placing agencies and licensing staff concerned with independent care; (4) work with newspapers in providing publicity concerning the licensing of day care homes, as well as work around the problem of advertisements of unlicensed homes by independent day care mothers;

(5) radio and television interviews or formal presentations; (6) speeches to community clubs, civic groups, and high school classes; (7) participation on community committees set up to deal with various problems related to child welfare functions; (8) participation in formal community surveys of day care resources; and (9) preparation and distribution of informational pamphlets dealing with day care and licensing.[43]

Results from the examination of the ways in which the trainees carried out community organization tasks led to these conclusions: (1) community organization tasks as a part of the licensing function are an essential and complex requirement, if they are to contribute to a planned, coordinated pattern in an organized program of community education; (2) nonprofessional staff can be motivated to feel responsible for these tasks and to see the interrelationship of the larger child welfare problems to their own day-by-day job; (3) in addition, such staff persons can be taught to furnish ideas and to perform some of the community organization tasks in the licensing function effectively, though this performance requires the backing of shared responsibility with agency supervisors and administrators and the support that comes from joint effort toward common goals; and (4) trainees, generally, received support for and interest in this part of the demonstration from their agency administrators and supervisors; significantly, however, most of these community experiences came about because of the demonstration, rather than as an integral part of an already ongoing, organized, assertive program of community education.

---

[43] See Appendix II, pp. 155, for brief descriptions of trainees' activity in community organization tasks of licensing.

It was noted, further, that none of the reports showed the trainees participating in agency efforts to reformulate and upgrade licensing standards, e.g., by channeling back to appropriate agency personnel the kinds of information which front line staff receive as to the need for or readiness of the public to raise standards.

It can be added that while a study such as this can demonstrate the interest and capability of trained nonprofessional staff, if this is to have meaningful effect, opportunities to add this learning and capability into practice must be provided by means of a planned, continuous program under the direction of administrators and supervisory staff, in the organized setting of licensing practice.

A Comparison of Training Demonstrations

When the various training demonstrations were undertaken, it was assumed that there might be significant differences between one group over another in trainee performance on the job.

When trainee performance was compared for each of the Training Groups, it was evident that the differences were minimal. No trainee group emerged as clearly superior in achievement or performance to the others.

At first glance this appeared to say that the choice of training method is not crucial in preparing the nonprofessional staff person to perform the tasks of licensing of family homes. If this is so, then the agency could choose a training plan on the basis of cost, administrative setting, available teaching personnel, or other practical preference.

It must be pointed out, however, that these training demonstrations did not illustrate actual differences in "method." The chief differences were in auspice and teaching personnel. Overriding these differences were important constant factors in all the demonstrations, e.g., the same set of teaching materials based on an analysis of the function for which training was being given, the same teaching objectives, and careful planning prior to the training sessions with attention to the same concerns about teaching and learning.

There is a danger in concluding that the means by which training is given is unimportant, and such a conclusion is not warranted by this study. Rather, a variety of means may prove successful, given certain important ingredients such as useful training materials, clear and consistent teaching objectives, thorough planning, and support by the administrative staff in relation to the function for which training is given.[44]

Since no trainee group was clearly superior in achievement or performance to others, some additional analysis of data was undertaken to determine whether there were differences in achievement and performance when trainees were regrouped according to the following variables:

---

[44] An additional useful demonstration would be to measure the performance of trainees who were trained by a program of self-study, using the same set of training materials and evaluation measures as for the demonstrations herein reported.

(1) over age 25 versus age 25 or under; (2) four years of college completed versus less than four years; (3) having had previous experience in a social welfare position versus no previous experience.

No significant differences in results on the various evaluation measures were found when trainees were grouped according to these variables ($p<.05$ for each comparison). There may be two reasons for this. First, our sample of trainees was too small for statistically significant differences to emerge, even if such differences existed; and second, the variables selected were the ones available in the data, rather than having been planned and selected for their theoretical significance. More meaningful variables might be "degree of trainee's interest and involvement in the project," "quality of supervision," "degree of administrative support for the function for which training was given." Project staff lacked reliable information on which to categorize trainees by these variables.

How did the Participants Regard the Demonstrations?

As part of the evaluation of three of the training demonstration groups, (State A and State B of Training Method II, and Training Method III) questionnaires were sent to 72 persons who had been concerned with these demonstrations: 33 trainees, 29 supervisors, and 10 state liaisons. Sixty-nine questionnaires were returned (95 per cent).[45]

---

[45] See Appendix A, pp. 9-11 for copy of the questionnaire.

The assumption was made that the effectiveness of a demonstration would be related to the degree of importance which staff of an agency attached to the function under study. Therefore, respondents were first asked, "In your opinion, how important is the licensing of family homes (both full-time and day care) in relation to other services for children?" An answer was to be indicated by checking "very important," "moderately important," or "of very little importance." Space was provided to answer a further inquiry, "Please tell us why you think so."

Eighty-seven per cent of the respondents checked "very important" and the remainder checked "moderately important." Respondents who had been connected with the Training Method III showed a more favorable response -- 93 per cent "very important," while 76 per cent of the respondents from State A and 59 per cent from State B checked "very important."

Examples of answers as to why respondents indicated that licensing of family homes is "very important" are as follows:

> "I feel very strongly about the protection of children away from their own homes for care; I believe licensing helps give a minimum of protection. . . . It helps the day care mother recognize the responsibilities involved in child care. . . . It is one way of serving many children."

> "The effect of day care or 24-hour foster care on a child is immeasurable. In many cases these facilities affect and develop the child as much as their own families do and in 24-hour care, often more. The fact that family homes should simulate a family setting makes it important that licensing standards assure that this happens. The amount of time children spend in these homes and their need for good family experiences when away from their parents makes licensing very important."

> "It is my opinion that good day care is a type of preventive work with what could otherwise be dependent and/or neglected children."
>
> "It demonstrates democracy's recognition of the worth of its children."
>
> "If all children who need care and protection outside of their own homes were in licensed homes, much of the work in child welfare services would be eliminated."

The 10 respondents (14 per cent) who indicated that licensing was only "moderately important" explained their rating in these kinds of answers:

> "I feel that the licensing program I undertook was of very little importance. Because of the small scope of the program and the lack of authority in carrying out the program, I had to work with homes that would cooperate. Most of those that cooperated were adequate. Those that refused to cooperate and didn't meet standards caused me some worry, but I did not have the authority to enforce the law on these few homes."
>
> "I would tend to rank counseling and contact in the home with parents of much more value."
>
> "The licensing of homes for day care is of little importance to our child welfare program. Other problems, much more severe than day care arrangements, enter into the removal of children. From the standpoint of time available, it is almost impossible to provide personnel to do day care licensing."
>
> "I feel it is important if people are really doing it on a business basis. If the parents are friends of the boarding parents, then it is not so important."
>
> "When I first left the training session I was convinced that licensing homes was of utmost importance. However, after returning to my own office, and finding the licensing process somewhat de-emphasized, I slowly lost my once strong conviction. It was pointed out to me that the community had managed to get along very well without licensed homes in the past and this sudden concern for licensing seemed unwarranted."

The second major question asked of respondents was "In your opinion, how satisfactory or helpful was the training course?" Four choices were offered: "very satisfactory and helpful"; "moderately satisfactory and helpful"; "not nearly as satisfactory and helpful as would be desirable"; and "scarcely satisfactory or helpful at all."

Seventy-five per cent of the respondents (52 persons) answered "very satisfactory and helpful." The remainder answered "moderately satisfactory and helpful," except for two persons who indicated "not nearly as satisfactory or helpful as would be desirable."

As with the first major question, respondents who had been connected with the Supervisors' Training demonstration showed a more favorable response: 92.5 per cent indicating the training had been "very satisfactory and helpful" compared to 71 per cent of State B and 68 per cent of State A who gave this response.

Respondents were then offered a series of 19 statements and asked to check any or none which helped to explain why they had rated the training course as they did. Sixteen of these statements were matched positive and negative items.

Four sets of responses which could be checked had to do with the satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with the curriculum materials. Responses showed a very favorable reaction to the usefulness, organization, and coverage of the training materials.

Some of the additional responses had to do with two factors which appeared interrelated: the role of the supervisor before and after the training; and the problem of time to devote to training, learning, and continuing help on the job.

For example, 35 persons said, "The training was about the right length of time for workers to have a chance to absorb what they learned and be ready to put it to use," in contrast to six who indicated, "The training was not long enough for the workers to learn what they needed to know." These responses were about in even proportions between the three training groups, and between supervisors and trainees. In addition, 37 persons checked, "The supervisor of the worker had a chance to learn about the project and to know what training would be carried out," in contrast to six persons who checked, "There was no real part in the training or the project for the supervisor who was expected to help the worker after training." These positive responses were again in about even proportion between supervisors and trainees.

However, 26 persons said, "There was not sufficient time on the job for the supervisor to follow through on training." This dissatisfaction was pointed up further when respondents were asked to add in their own words any additional reasons that helped to explain why they checked as they did how satisfactory or helpful the training course had been. Examples of these free responses follow:

> "In a county welfare department where there is a great diversification of services, heavy caseloads, and limited staff, it is difficult for one supervisor to devote adequate time to the trainee in following through on training and at the same time provide equitable time to other caseworkers on the staff."

> "There were too many cases other than licensing studies in my caseload which tended to take precedence over the licensing work and prevented my working through on these studies in the manner I would have preferred."

> "I feel the need for more consolidation time, for conditions more conducive to widening perspective. . . . The problem area for me was the pressure of other agency responsibilities. This is a typical agency problem, but one about which I feel very strongly, believing it to be self-defeating, agency defeating, and therefore client and social work defeating. I would have checked "very satisfactory" rather than "moderately" had it not been for the pressure elements in relation to the course and the agency."

> "Unfortunately the work of licensing had to be carried on faster than we could study the syllabus or read the case exercises; new work moved faster than our conferences regarding the syllabus."

> "The main problem was lack of adequate time to discuss the material and to gain the full benefit of this learning experience."

Some of the free responses were more directly focused on the unsatisfying role of the supervisor in the training process because of agency time pressures. Examples follow:

> "I was allowed to proceed and carry through on these studies without supervision because of lack of time on her part. In order to really gain as much as I could from the studies, I would prefer working in close contact with a supervisor who had enough time to adequately guide me so I would know how better to conduct a study, appraise and evaluate one, and learn to improve through this experience."

> "The supervisor seems to be covered up with other areas of public welfare."

> "As a supervisor, I was too involved with two uncovered public assistance caseloads to give the trainee the help I should have."

> "The supervisor should have been with the group during the entire training period. Many times during a conference about a case it was necessary to take time to prove every point about licensing to the supervisor."

On a more positive note, it is significant that an examination of the free responses to explain why the training course had been rated as "very satisfactory and helpful" points up that for many of these respondents the benefits were directly related to a strengthened supervisor-worker relationship or capacity to discharge supervisory duties. Examples follow:

> [From a supervisor] "A staff was just in process of being hired to do the work under my supervision. I knew agency placement work but nothing of independent licensing. To receive guidance to train was a beautiful gift."
>
> [From another supervisor] "As the field of day care and licensing were new to me, the training project was most helpful to me. I felt I was learning along with my trainee. Had I not been fortunate enough to come to the present position at a time when the training project was just beginning I would have had to learn by trial and error."
>
> [From her trainee] "The reading and discussion of the syllabus and material gave my supervisor and me a unique opportunity to get well acquainted with day care theory and practice and with each other while digging into a caseload which was new to both of us but rich in problems closely related to the training course."
>
> "The conferences held between supervisor and workers which allowed and encouraged free exchange of ideas and experiences was the most helpful to me."
>
> [From state liaison] "The licensing supervisors particularly were stimulated by the project to evaluate the department's licensing operation and to suggest areas for discussion and possible policy and procedural changes."
>
> [From state liaison] "One of the benefits of the training program has been the learning that took place at various levels of supervision and administrative staff who had any contacts with or responsibilities for the training project."

A third question on the evaluation form was "If a training course like this was to be repeated, what changes do you think would be desirable?" There were a limited number of miscellaneous replies which formed no pattern but a very frequent reply had to do again with the matter of "pressures" and "time." Examples follow:

> "It was difficult to carry a full caseload and give adequate time to the training sessions at the same time."

"As little demands as possible from regular caseloads during the training period."

"I would hope that the supervisor would not be bogged down with numerous other responsibilities."

"Definite periods of time to be set up for the training periods."

"Would hope the agency would release one morning or some set period of time each week to be devoted to study and completion of training."

Conclusions: (1) A large majority of the respondents from the field considered licensing of family homes as of high importance in relation to other social services for children, with respondents from the Supervisors' Training demonstration registering the higher majority opinion; (2) A large majority rated the training course as having been very satisfactory and helpful, again with the respondents from the Supervisors' Training demonstration registering the higher majority opinion; (3) The participants responded very favorably to the usefulness, organization, and coverage of the training materials. This finding adds credence to an assumption of the project: that useful training materials for the nonprofessional worker can be developed outside of a particular agency with its specific procedures, geographical location, or particular stage of development in licensing practice, and that these materials can be adapted to a variety of teaching situations, and levels of ability to teach and to learn; (4) Where agency conditions are conducive to continued teaching and learning on the job, training such as was carried out, can strengthen the supervisory role and the satisfactions of the supervisor-worker relationship; and (5) Pressures of heavy work loads and insufficient time reserved for supervisory teaching often mitigate against maximum benefits of a formal training course.

V. OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Before proceeding to a summary of findings from this three-year demonstration, let us briefly recapitulate the background of the project and the order of its various operations.

The stimulus for this three-year cooperative venture in staff development arose out of the concern about the crucial manpower shortages in public welfare, and problems in the use of nonprofessional persons in social work positions. The project was based on a belief that graduate schools are in a favorable position to give leadership in new approaches to training and use of nonprofessional staff. The aim was to give a measure of assistance to states in meeting their appropriate responsibility for sound in-service training programs, and at the same time, to inject into the training some of the values and scholarship attached to education in a graduate school of social work.

The beginning step was taken when the School and a public child welfare agency meshed their common concerns into a problem for systematic investigation -- the use of nonprofessional persons in the licensing of family homes. The operations which followed encompassed (1) an analysis of the function of licensing; (2) the development of curriculum materials; (3) recruitment among the states for participation in the demonstrations to follow; (4) the setting of a standard of competence for the tasks contained in the agency function under study; (5) a pilot training demonstration followed by three separate and varying training demonstrations; and (6) an evaluation of the demonstrations and the performance of the trainees, with particular attention to identifying (a) the tasks which the nonprofessional person performed successfully, (b) those tasks which presented difficulty, (c) some of the factors involved in this difficulty, and (d) some of the ingredients in a successful in-service training course under any auspices.

The following is an overall summary statement of findings and conclusions from the evaluation of the demonstrations:

1. Most of the nonprofessional trainees performed all the tasks in the licensing of family homes at a level which satisfied agency expectations.

2. Except for recording tasks, most of the trainees did most of the central as well as the peripheral tasks in the licensing of family homes, as measured by various evaluative instruments developed for the project, at a level of competence which met agency responsibility at least minimally.

3. There is evidence that some trainees successfully performed the tasks generally thought to be most difficult, e.g., supervision-consultation to a licensee, community organization tasks, and use of authority in unsatisfactory situations. When trainees did not perform these tasks, it was often evident that there had been little or no expectation or support within the agency for this activity.

The full potentialities of nonprofessional persons in the function of licensing family homes was not measured. Our evaluative procedures did not provide for this, and the agency work setting did not lend itself to this measurement. There is reason to believe that the potentialities of many of the trainees for performance of the tasks under study was higher than the agencies required.

4. There were tasks which a considerable number of trainees did not do successfully. These were tasks in the use of authority in unsatisfactory situations, tasks contained in supervision-consultation to a licensee, adequate study at a time of relicensing. These are tasks for which reinforced training or supervisory help is recommended.

5. In addition, none of the trainees performed recording tasks, i.e., wrote case records, at the level of competence set by experts as necessary to meet agency responsibility minimally.

Explanations for this finding appear to lie in a number of factors: The skills involved in recording are difficult ones to acquire; these skills were not taught in the training sessions, nor were agencies especially urged to give attention to helping trainees learn these skills on the job; the traditional recording procedures of the agencies provided a sterile model for trainees to follow; and experts apparently set a theoretical standard different from practice expectations, illustrating the confusion in the field about the purpose and nature of social work recording.

6. No differences were found when trainee performance was compared for each of the training groups. Therefore, it was concluded that a variety of means of training can prove successful, given certain important ingredients, such as useful training materials, clear and consistent

teaching objectives, and thorough planning and support by the administrative staff in relation to the function for which training is given.

7. No differences were found in performance when trainees were regrouped according to age, level of education, or the fact of prior experience in a social welfare position. This suggested that nonprofessional persons who have varying characteristics of age, education, and amount of experience can be recruited and assigned successfully to the licensing of family homes.

8. An analysis of a function and its tasks is an important forerunner to development of effective training materials, teaching sessions, and agreement upon a standard of competence.

9. Training materials can be developed for wider use than a single agency or state if they are well oriented both to theory and practice and are based on an analysis of the function for which training is being given.

10. There is value in a realistic standard of competence that has meaning to agencies in the way practice is carried out today, i.e., a level of competence which experts agree will meet agency responsibility at least minimally.

It is apparent that nonprofessional persons are an essential part of the manpower resources of child welfare agencies. Therefore, it is imperative that attention be given to developing and utilizing most effectively their potential skills in behalf of children and their families. The type of investigation which has been reported, with its focus on an analysis of the tasks within a particular child welfare function, is one important approach to understanding and resolving problems in the use of manpower in child welfare.

Finally, it should be noted that the licensing function in the network of services for children and their families is one which has a considerable potential for improving the level of care for large numbers of children. How this potential is exploited, however, appears to depend a great deal upon the value attached within agencies to this function, and the training and expectation for performance which accompany the employment and use of nonprofessional persons.

VI. SCHOOL-AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

As a closing note to this report, it may be useful to discuss some of the administrative factors associated with those demonstration and research activities which involve shared responsibility and cooperation between a graduate school of social work and public welfare agencies. As we described these demonstrations, and the findings stemming from them, we began to look back upon the factors which had facilitated collaboration between school and agency, and the obstacles to cooperation which had to be dealt with or minimized at various stages of the project. The problems in cooperation appeared to arise from basic differences in the function and organizational structure of the two institutions.

Difference in function: The chief function of a university, and a school of social work within a university, is the advancement of learning through education and research. While the university may assume certain more subsidiary and service-oriented functions, these are still related to the central functions of education and research. In contrast, the function of the public welfare agency is primarily the implementation of a prescribed program of social welfare services. It may invest some of its resources in research undertakings or field instruction of graduate students, but its primary obligation is always one of service.

These different functions of school and agency are bound together because of a common commitment to long-term social welfare goals.

Nevertheless, the differences in functions are basic ones, leading to different values, and different expectations of the benefits to be obtained from shared cooperation.

Differences in structure: There are a number of differences between school and agency in their organizational structure. In this project, we were primarily concerned with these three: autonomy of staff, accountability, and means of communication.

Within the school organizational pattern, the faculty member has considerable freedom in discharging his work obligations. While he has prescribed duties to perform, he has considerable latitude in deciding how he carries them out, and how he will invest his time and energies in the advancement of learning beyond these duties. He can make choices in relation to his values, his professional identifications, and his particular curiosities. He gains recognition for contributing to the flow of school work in ways that advance new ideas, test new theories, answer existing questions, and raise new ones.

Within the public welfare agency, the staff member at all levels has much less autonomy. He must carry out his professional obligations under more specifically prescribed conditions. He is responsible for helping to implement a program of services to people, usually through well-tested procedures and within a framework of agency policy. To succeed, he must be able to expedite, withstand pressures, stay within the organizational pattern, and postpone his own work preferences.

A second difference between school and agency structure is in accountability. The accountability of a school is a relatively long-term one. While there is increasing pressure on our colleges and universities to meet "demands for service" by admitting more and more students who need and desire higher education, by and large the accountability is regarded as only partially discharged when enrollment is increased. The university's supporting public is generally accepting of the fact that a fulfillment of the goals of education extends over a period of years, even generations.

In contrast, the accountability of a public welfare agency is relatively short-term. Services must be given and people's needs met as well as present circumstances will permit. While there is some recognition that people do not change quickly, and that some results of social welfare services may not be seen for years, by and large the expectation is that service will be given and some concrete benefit will become visible. The supporting public generally exacts this short-term accountability, as is evidenced by its greater readiness to criticize, offer ready-made solutions, and legislate changes in the program.

A third difference between school and agency structure lies in means of communication -- between and within the institutions. The school staff is generally inclined to follow informal means of communication, as opposed to the more formal and prescribed means of communication of the agency.

These differences in organizational structure logically lead to differences in methods of operation. It was because of these differences in methods that potential obstacles to cooperation most often arose.

Now that these obstacles have been dealt with, and the cooperative efforts have been successfully concluded, what has the school learned about participating in this type of staff development program?[1]

Problems in communication: The difference in administrative structure of school and agency created some degree of distance, and forced us to learn *how* to communicate successfully. We found that this communication could be accomplished most effectively by assigning a staff member to work closely with the agencies at state, regional, and local levels. Necessarily, this was a person who could respect the agencies' formal channels of communication, who could "feel with" the kinds of pressures under which administrators and supervisors in public child welfare work, and who could still retain an identification with the project aims and methods.

---

[1] The following observations are presented from the vantage point of the school project staff. If at times there seems to be an implication that "the school is right and the agency is wrong," such is not intended, and only reflects the particular position from which these observations had to be formulated. The cooperation we received from public child welfare agencies has encompassed a generous willingness to adapt customary procedures, to consider new ideas, to add hours to the already long work day, and to wait with patience while the project staff relearned the climate and demands with which the public child welfare agency must cope. But only as differences between school and agency are recognized, as well as the sources which give rise to them, can these differences be resolved into a constructive working relationship.

It became apparent early in the recruitment operations that the school could move faster and more independently than the public welfare agency, which required more time for the machinery to be oiled and put into motion. The school staff, with its relatively high degree of autonomy, evolved a design for the investigation, fairly readily secured assurances of interest and help from other parts of the university, made commitments, and was ready to proceed with the demonstrations.

The agencies, by contrast, required more time to consider the proposals and to communicate within its broad setting. This communication had to proceed in orderly but time-consuming channels -- from administrator to consultant and field representative, to local directors and supervisors, and in some cases, to local advisory boards. The public welfare personnel, whose day-by-day cooperation was most crucial if the decision was made to participate in the cooperative project, had the least autonomy.

The fact that the public welfare worker or supervisor has a lesser degree of autonomy within his organization makes for certain potential hazards in gathering data. For example, it seemed important to school staff that the supervisors who were participating in Training Method III be able to communicate with us as freely as possible during the course of their teaching sessions, and in an evaluation of their trainees' work performance. A number of these supervisors were very doubtful, in the initial stages of their demonstrations, that they would be able to correspond directly with project staff without this communication being seen, shared with, or approved by their administrative staff. When this apprehension proved to be true in some agencies, special attention was given to resolving these obstacles through fuller interpretation of the methods and goals of the evaluation. The obstacles had not been intentionally placed, but were a part of the routine organizational patterns of work in the agency. The differences were resolved completely in all but one state. The uncertainty, however, about the possibility of public welfare staff being able to communicate directly and freely in relation to a research problem highlights one of the basic differences in the administrative setting of public welfare and a university, and has significance for investigators who may be planning certain kinds of research or demonstrations in public welfare settings.

Work pressures which affected cooperation: We found a difference, generally, in the interest and response to the project at the state and local level which made realistic planning difficult. The usual pattern when invitations to participate in the demonstrations were extended, was one of enthusiasm at the state level, which diminished as discussion moved closer to the local level where the project would finally be carried out. Some of this lessened enthusiasm at the local level was related to chronic resistance to change and innovation. Perhaps more of it had a very tangible basis: This is where the work pressures were very great with less recognition and reward. As an example of the realism which sometimes tempered enthusiasm at the local level, we found that only in a few instances, where new positions were created, were the job pressures lessened to facilitate the individual staff member's participation in the demonstration. Most often the additional duties were merged into an already existing work load.

After the Pilot Demonstrations, we moved into work with 10 different state departments of public welfare. Then it became impossible to hold to a uniform set of criteria for selection of trainees. The design of our demonstrations initially identified the nonprofessional trainee as "a person with a college degree, no prior work experience in a social welfare agency, and assigned full-time to the licensing of independent foster homes." Very early in the project, however, agencies reflected pressure to recruit and use nonprofessional staff when and where they could, and in the end, the only firm criteria we were able to maintain for selection of trainees was that they be acceptable to the agencies under their usual hiring practices and that they not have any graduate education in social work. It was evident that the agencies have considerable difficulty in recruitment of manpower. Either there are not enough suitable nonprofessional applicants for the number of social welfare positions, or ineffective means are used to reach the suitable applicants. Hiring procedures, for a variety of reasons, often seemed cumbersome and inflexible. Our early efforts to have new trainees begin work in their various offices at about the same time could not be effected. Sometimes trainees could not be taken on, though needed and located, because of lack of a supervisor in a particular office.

As the project proceeded and our criteria for selection of "nonprofessional trainee" had to be relaxed, the experience we had in the Pilot

Demonstration came to stand as a landmark never to be repeated. In this instance, there were six trainees, all with no social work experience and with comparable education, all of whom began work on the same day in five different offices of one state, all of whom received three days of similarly planned orientation to the agency before coming to the training sessions. In addition, all six were assigned full-time to the licensing of independent family homes. In retrospect, this was possible only because we were working with only one state and a number of staff persons in that state put concentrated effort into accomplishing this feat, an effort which they felt could not be repeated.

During the course of these recruitment operations,[2] the inability to hold to the planned set of criteria for selection of trainees was a source of considerable frustration to project staff. Similarly, it was hard to accept the fact that the states who were invited to participate in Training Method I could not assign as many trainees to the project as could have been accepted for training. These factors appear reasonable, however, in light of school and agency difference in function. The school was attempting to carry out a demonstration to investigate the use of nonprofessional personnel in a function not fully accepted nor always regarded as of high priority in the range of child welfare services, but one which the school staff believed had a potentiality for improving the care of children outside their own homes. The agencies, in turn, had various assignments ready for any staff which could be newly recruited, assignments which were related to functions where there was a more pressing demand for service.

---

[2] See Progress Report, December, 1964, for a fuller account of the recruitment operations of each of the three demonstrated methods of training.

Generally, the agencies all showed reluctance to commit themselves to cooperation for a stated period of months, as was necessary if a systematic investigation was to be completed. To some extent this was a reflection of inability to foresee what staff resources would be available and what new pressing demands for service might arise. It also related to the fact that agencies have an increasing number of opportunities and requests to participate in various training sessions or workshops, many of which carry no commitment for future expenditure of money or staff time, as participation in this project did. This meant that the school staff had to interpret the project in terms that gave it value to the public welfare staff; that is, in relation to their areas of self-interest. This was easier when we encountered an already developed interest in the licensing function. There was not always this interest, and sometimes participation from states came about for reasons other than interest in extending the licensing authority or systematically investigating the use of nonprofessional manpower, e.g., the status believed to accrue by participation in a "research" project, or the opportunity for a newly appointed staff person to launch a staff development program.

Differences in expectations in relation to the demonstrations: There were indications of differences in expectations between school and agency as to benefits or uses to come from the demonstrations. For example, there was some unanticipated difficulty in engaging the interest of public welfare personnel in the significance of systematic investigation of a problem. It was often hard to elicit interest in a careful evaluation of the demonstration; the chief interest was in training per se and in the training materials.

In some instances, once the training demonstrations were completed, then it was not easy to hold the agencies to specified trainee work assignments for the agreed upon number of months. The school saw the period of work experience as an extension of training, enhancing its educational value, as well as being necessary to completion of a systematic evaluation of worker performance. The agency, as the implementor of a service program, regarded the training as a means to facilitate flexible use of staff in getting its cases handled. The period of work experience following training, therefore, was the end product, a time to realize benefits from training. These experiences point up again the urgency of the need for training programs and for flexibility in the assignment of available staff persons. But equally clear is the perspective needed in relation to systematic study of long-term manpower problems.

Another illustration of differences in expectations between school and agency in relation to the demonstrations can be seen in the kinds of tasks which each selected for emphasis in worker performance on the job. It will be recalled that a panel of experts drawn from the field of public child welfare was asked to set up a standard of competence for the performance of the licensing tasks. The experts did this by determining how well or how often trainees must perform the various licensing tasks for agency responsibility to be met minimally.[3] It was found that those tasks that were most closely identified with agency structure received some of the highest ratings given by experts.[4] For example, tasks concerned with "completing routine requirements of licensing on time" were given considerably higher ratings by the experts than those concerned with providing supervision-consultation to the licensee or those concerned with "gathering pertinent information about the psychological resources of a potential foster home." Other similar examples could be noted. Furthermore, within the general area of "completing required statistical reports," the experts gave a much higher rating to items concerned with "completing the reports accurately and on time" than for "using these reports to facilitate the worker's own work." In the tasks of recording, the experts set a higher standard for recording "according to the routine of the agency" and for "completing records on time" than for "incorporating appropriate feeling tone" in the records or for "selecting clearly pertinent material for inclusion in the record."

Further evidence of the importance attached within public child welfare to the tasks of agency structure comes from the Supervisory Rating Scale, where the trainees' supervisors were asked to list the areas in which the trainees needed the greatest amount of supervision. It is clear that the process of supervisory evaluation of worker performance remained a relatively subjective process despite attempts to objectify this process by developing a scale. To a considerable extent, the rating process rested on the specific expectations of the supervisor performing the evaluation. Accordingly, it seemed likely that the areas noted as requiring the greatest amount of supervision probably approximated rather closely the areas in which the supervisors had relatively specific and higher expectations. Under these circumstances, it was interesting to note that the need by trainees for extra supervision in the performance of agency structure tasks, e.g., planning work time, recording, completing routine requirements, was mentioned by supervisors almost twice as often as any other category of tasks.[5] The evaluation instruments other than the Supervisory Scale, however, pointed up that a considerable number of trainees needed further help in the tasks of supervision-consultation, tasks which involved the use of authority, and study tasks at the time a license was reissued.

---

[3] See Chapter II, pp. 11-28.

[4] See Table 5, p. 169, for listing of tasks of agency structure.

It is reasonable to assume that the supervisors had higher expectations for the performance of agency structure tasks because these tasks were directly related to coping with the most insistent work pressures. School staff, however, removed from direct responsibility for meeting these pressures, had a more theoretical concern with teaching trainees the knowledge and skills that would move the overall level of practice in licensing toward an improved level of care for children. School staff, therefore, selected for emphasis such tasks as those contained in the study of the home, supervision-consultation to a licensee, the community organization tasks of a licensing program, or work in relation to the natural parents of children in independent care.

---

[5] See Table 13, p. 196.

External pressures which retard the use of training: When training had been completed, it was evident that certain kinds of demands and pressures frequently prevented a trainee from full use of the knowledge he had acquired during the training sessions. One of these pressures was the community demand for homes which often contributed to incomplete studies of homes or compromise with standards. The need for additional licensed facilities for the care of children outside their own homes, particularly during the day, was very great in most communities. The pressure felt within agencies to keep a home in use for particular children was often critical, particularly when alternatives for the children's care were not visible.

Another obstacle to a trainee's making full use of training, and one probably directly related to the agency's accountability, was seen in the agency's hesitation to require conformity to standards because it was aware of its "image" in a community where a licensing service was just beginning to be implemented. This was particularly true when the new service was not a part of a program of community education about the licensing law.

Still another obstacle was lack of administrative or supervisory knowledge or backing to carry out a denial of a license when a denial was indicated. The use of authority was not a problem for nonprofessional staff alone.

And finally, always present was the danger that heavy work loads would prevent the staff from considering adequately the matters relevant to a sound judgment about issuance or nonissuance of a license.

The key role of the supervisor: The success of the training seemed in most instances to hinge on the agency supervisor, who plays a key role in the development of child welfare programs, and in the problem of insufficient numbers of professional staff.

The supervisor has a determining influence in the kinds of work assignments given to staff and the importance attached to the different parts of his job by the worker himself. The supervisor is also very influential in the kinds of expectation for agency service and individual work performance which are held before the worker, thus contributing to the actual level of performance which the worker is able to maintain.

In spite of the key position they occupied, the supervisors were often used in ways which did not take advantage of their professional knowledge -- knowledge that, from the vantage point of the school, could have been used to raise a level of practice or extend a new service. In the first place, most of the supervisors appeared to have little or no time for teaching a body of knowledge to workers, beyond that which was necessary for the required work procedures. In their own professional training and development, these supervisors often have had little or no opportunity to gain a knowledge of learning theory, or to develop techniques of teaching, either individually through supervision or in groups. Nor were they used very often in direct service, such as joint interviewing to lend support to their worker, or to offer an example for learning, or in shared case responsibility for direct client contacts.

Instead, the role of the supervisor was most often seen as predominantly one of "expeditor," or management specialist in keeping the agency work moving along -- a logical concomitant of the agency's primary function of implementing a service program.

These factors in the role of the child welfare supervisor are ones which need to receive attention, if these key persons are to contribute as fully as they should be able to, in view of their professional education, to the training of the nonprofessional staff of their agencies.

Importance of school-agency cooperation: In spite of these problems, there was ample indication from this project that cooperative school-agency demonstrations can be productive in moving towards our common educational goals and can help to keep practice and social work education more closely related. Even though many problems were encountered, it must be emphasized that we received from many states and counties a high degree of cooperation, often made possible by the "after-hours" work of dedicated social workers in public child welfare. There were many expressions of appreciation from agency personnel for the satisfactions realized in working together towards mutual goals. In turn, the project staff persons from the school were able to reinforce their already present identification with child welfare, and to receive stimulation and new learning that can enrich the graduate classroom.

Above all, this project showed clearly that social work education and the staff development programs in agency practice are interdependent. Continued effective communication between school and agency is essential.

APPENDIX I.

Examples of Trainee Activity in Supervision-Consultation

1. A small day care center had been an offender against standards for several years. Staff shortages had prevented consistent supervisory visits by the agency. The trainee, with her supervisor, made a joint visit for the purpose of reviewing standards with the operator and making clear the changes that must be made to conform to the law. In subsequent follow-up visits, the trainee was able to maintain by herself the position of agency authority. This trainee, in several case records, showed a capacity to relate warmly to operators of small, struggling, and needed centers, and at the same time to use authority consistently to require that standards be met.

2. A complaint was received about the care given to children in a day care home. Trainee used the telephone complaint call to obtain specific information about the nature of the complaint, and to secure the complainant's name and promise of continued cooperation. Visits were made to discuss with the licensee the complaint and the substandard areas of operation. A confirming letter was sent to the licensee listing areas where standards were not met, setting a time limit within which the center had to be brought up to conformity to standards if the license was to be continued, offering an appointment with trainee's supervisor to review the findings, and offering help in consideration of how standards could be met.

When standards were not met and the decision was made to deny license at the time of reissuance, which was imminent, trainee interviewed a natural mother of a child in care to make clear that new plans of care would have to be made. Because the mother appeared unable to make new plans and lacked knowledge of what her child needed, the trainee referred her for casework services around the needs of her child.

3. Trainee gave consultation to a licensed independent foster mother around problems of a day care child. The licensee believed that the child's mother was deliberately administering overdoses of medicine to the child which resulted in passivity bordering on a stuporous state. The mother was requesting the the licensee administer additional doses of medicine during the day. Trainee observed the child, confirmed the foster mother's observations, consulted with her about what action she should take, interpreted the standards about the use of medicines in the day care home to both licensee and natural mother, and referred the situation to the child welfare unit for protective services.

4. A licensee suspected mental retardation in a young child to whom she was giving day care. Trainee responded to licensee's concern, cleared for use of community resources for psychological observation and physical examination, and helped licensee know how to get this done through the natural mother.

5. Trainee consulted with a natural father around how to find and choose a good licensed home for his two-year-old son. Trainee showed sensitivity to underlying problems in the home of the inquirer, and gave

well accepted suggestions about use of the local family agency for these problems.

6. Trainee acted as a referent for a natural mother as to where she could find a licensed independent home. Trainee then followed-up with consultation to licensee about ways of receiving the child for care, licensee's future relationship to natural mother, and the child's behavior. Trainee thus helped the mother find a good resource for her child and acted to preserve and reinforce the role of the natural parent with the licensee.

APPENDIX II.

Examples of Trainee Activity in Community Organization Tasks of Licensing

1. One trainee reported an interview with a zoning commissioner in an effort to come to a mutual understanding of the overlapping interests in the zoning ordinance and the licensing function. The trainee assumed responsibility for interpreting the need for good day care homes in residential neighborhoods as well as the general philosophy behind the licensing statute. The result was a working agreement between the commissioner and the trainee, as representative of his agency, about information to be given the applicant for license about zoning regulations and the way in which complaints should be handled and hopefully resolved.

Another trainee reported activity growing out of his concern for the future of day care home licensing if the zoning ordinance was to be as strictly enforced as seemed imminent. With the help of his supervisor, this concern was shared with representatives of other children's agencies, pointing up the common concern for the effect which rigid enforcement of the zoning ordinance would have upon independent day care homes as well as agency full-time homes. The trainee became an agency representative in a group which formed to study and define the interrelationship of the zoning authority and the licensing authority and the availability of foster homes. The goal was to agree upon a recommendation which could be made to the zoning authority. The trainee's role was in interpretation of the need for larger numbers of day care homes in various kinds of residential neighborhoods.

2. Trainees showed ability to use specific case situations to interpret some facet of the licensing function to other social agency staff and persons in the community, and to bring gaps in services and in the implementation of the licensing law to the attention of supervisors and administrators.

In discussion between a court worker and trainee of the problems in a particular case, the court worker made reference to the number of children attending school who were living in unrelated homes, not under the supervision of any agency.

Another trainee learned that the staff of another agency was using unlicensed facilities for the referral of parents seeking placement of handicapped children.

In both instances, the trainees followed through with this information to interpret the actuality of the licensing law, the philosophy behind it, the nature of licensing standards, and secured the cooperation of the other agency workers in bringing unlicensed homes under the authority of the licensing law.

In another instance, a trainee, while discussing an applicant with a person named as reference, elicited the latter's interest in licensing to such an extent that he arranged for her to speak to a men's church group concerning the licensing function and its relationship to the needs of children.

3. In some reported experiences, trainees showed the extent to which their knowledge about the licensing function was ready for use by being able to think clearly and present ideas logically in situations that could not be anticipated or fully planned.

In one community that had just begun to implement the licensing law after years of inactivity, the agency invited the interest of the local newspaper with the hope of gaining some helpful newspaper interpretation of the licensing program.

In the interview which followed, the reporter assigned to the story was, in his initial attitude, openly opposed to licensing and termed it an invasion of the privacy of the family. Although the trainee's supervisor and administrator were present during the interview, the trainee carried responsibility for answering the questions and presenting information. In spite of the aggressive and critical questions of the reporter, the assurance and knowledge of the trainee as she related fact and philosophy concerning the licensing function carried a real impact. Her conviction about the role of licensing in giving protection to children was contagious.

As a result, the article which the reporter subsequently wrote was a very strong presentation of the importance to the community that the licensing law be fully implemented.

In another instance, a trainee was unexpectedly involved in an unplanned radio interview. This happened in a program where citizens in the community telephoned in to a master of ceremonies with questions about affairs in their community. One citizen had called wanting information about day care homes. The master of ceremonies, in turn, telephoned the child welfare office. In this live broadcast, the trainee and radio employee carried on a conversational exchange of information concerning the growing interest in day care, the licensing function, the requirements of the law, and the protection given the community's children by licensing. The trainee and supervisor were pleased that the trainee had been able to participate responsibly in this unplanned program. As a result of the broadcast, the agency had a number of new applications for license to give day care.

4. Some of the trainees reported instances in which they served as speakers or discussion leaders for community groups, sometimes to fulfill requests made of the agency by church or civic groups. One report reflected considerable initiative on the part of the trainee as well as support by the agency to use this initiative. This trainee met with teachers of high school home economic classes and reviewed the importance of licensing and the need for young high school girls to know of licensed day care facilities since many of them would become mothers in need of child care resources. The trainee refined and confirmed her plan through a series of memos exchanged between the supervisor and the trainee and between the trainee and the teachers. She then met at separate times with

nine home economic classes in two different high schools. There were approximately 25 girls in each class. The trainee dealt specifically with her work as a licensing staff member, describing licensing as one of the basic services of child welfare, and emphasized the importance of the use of licensed day care facilities for child care and protection. She also related licensing to one of several child welfare functions as a means of interesting girls of high school age in the social work field.

TABLE 1

RATING OF TASKS IN THE LICENSING OF INDEPENDENT FAMILY HOMES

Listed in Order of Importance

(Score of 3=very important; 2=important; 1=relatively unimportant)

	Description of Task	Score	Rated Inappropriate by 10% or more of respondents
1.	Interview applicant and members of family in own home to see whether or not they meet state requirements of personality and understanding of children.	2.87	
2.	Make an evaluation of applicant's home, stability of home, strengths and weaknesses of foster parents.	2.81	
3.	Make a recommendation concerning approval or rejection for licensing.	2.79	
4.	Interpret regulations and procedures of licensing to persons wishing to make application for a license.	2.76	
5.	Inspect home of applicant to see that standards of home conform to state requirements.	2.74	
6.	If recommendation is negative, submit evidence indicating points not met by home and family.	2.70	
7.	Act as representative of the State Department with responsibility for licensing independent homes.	2.69	
8.	Individualize members of home in terms of care which should be given a child through either day or overnight care.	2.66	
9.	Relicense home when license expires according to agency procedures, evaluating foster mother on basis of performance.	2.61	

Description of Task	Score	Rated Inappropriate by 10% or more of respondents
10. See that family is notified of decision regarding licensing of home and, where licensed, that license is sent.	2.60	13%
11. Compile necessary case record of the home, indicating manner in which home meets agency standards or not.	2.59	
12. Interview and screen, if indicated, applicants making application for license at office.	2.58	
13. Make necessary investigation to see if complaints are justified.	2.58	
14. Maintain cooperative working relationships with other workers in the office.	2.58	
15. Receive complaints of homes made by community people or others regarding a licensed home.	2.56	
16. Keep abreast of knowledge and procedures of office and of current thinking regarding licensing of independent foster homes.	2.55	
17. Consult with supervisor appropriately.	2.54	
18. Understand rationale of standards and flexible use of them.	2.53	
19. Make an evaluation of physical aspects of home regarding meeting state standards.	2.52	
20. Contact health, fire, sanitary public departments as necessary regarding possible hazards in the home.	2.51	
21. Consult with licensee as requested or deemed desirable regarding child care, child development, etc.	2.47	
22. Refer complaints and study to supervisor, or other established channels for handling complaints, including courts when necessary.	2.46	

Description of Task	Score	Rated Inappropriate by 10% or more of respondents
23. Interpret and explain the public interest in independent foster care and right of the public to exercise control.	2.39	13%
24. Give individualized consideration to persons wishing to find a day care home for their children.	2.34	13%
25. Provide general information regarding licensing regulations to anyone inquiring.	2.33	
26. Interpret regulations, philosophy, and procedures of licensing homes to community through newspaper articles, talks with community groups, and the like.	2.32	20%
27. Provide information to licensee regarding community resources for children.	2.30	
28. Work with newspapers regarding accepting applications to board children from licensed homes only.	2.18	20%
29. Maintain and submit necessary statistical records regarding licensing activities as required.	2.17	
30. Carry on necessary correspondence with applicants wishing to board children independently.	2.16	
31. Complete necessary forms maintained by the agency regarding all inquiries and applications.	2.15	
32. Interview references as required regarding opinion of applicant to receive a license.	2.11	
33. Evaluate application of standards with possible revision of minimal standards as an objective.	2.10	10%
34. Screen applicants making application by phone for a license to board children.	2.04	23%

TABLE 2

SUPERVISORY RATING SCALE

Standard Scores and Weights from Factor Analysis of Experts' Ratings

	Factor I		Factor II, Position a		Factor II, Position b	
Item#	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight
1.	2.0381	.0630	2.1681	.0663	1.8253	.0549
2.	1.8763	.0580	1.9909	.0609	1.6887	.0508
3. (4)	2.4586	.0760	2.4353	.0745	2.4968	.0750
4. (6)	2.4263	.0750	2.3408	.0716	2.5662	.0771
5. (7)	2.9439	.0910	3.0354	.0928	2.7941	.0840
6. (9)	2.3292	.0720	2.3829	.0729	2.2414	.0674
7.(12)	2.2645	.0700	2.5640	.0784	1.7744	.0533
8.(16)	2.3292	.0720	2.3509	.0719	2.2937	.0689
9.(18)	2.1675	.0670	2.2692	.0694	2.0010	.0601
10.(19)	2.6204	.0810	2.9508	.0902	2.0797	.0625
11.(21)	2.1675	.0670	2.3951	.0732	1.7951	.0540
12.(24)	2.1028	.0650	2.5446	.0778	1.3799	.0415
13.(40)	2.4910	.0770	2.4398	.0746	2.5747	.0774
14.(45)	2.7822	.0860	2.8352	.0867	2.6954	.0810
15.(46)	3.0733	.0950	2.9115	.0890	3.3381	.1003
16.(48)	2.7822	.0860	2.7185	.0831	2.8864	.0868
17.(50)	3.1704	.0980	3.0867	.0944	3.3074	.0994
18.(51)	2.9763	.0920	3.0791	.0941	2.8080	.0844
19.(52)	2.9763	.0920	3.0329	.0927	2.8836	.0867
20.(53)	2.8792	.0890	2.8966	.0886	2.8508	.0857
21.(56)	3.1704	.0980	3.2023	.0979	3.1182	.0937
22.(57)	3.2351	.1000	3.2629	.0998	3.1896	.0959
23.(58)	3.2351	.1000	3.3258	.1017	3.0866	.0928
24.(59)	2.8145	.0870	2.8292	.0865	2.7904	.0839
25.(60)	3.0733	.0950	3.0456	.0931	3.1187	.0937
26.(61)	2.8145	.0870	2.8656	.0876	2.7308	.0821
27.(63)	2.5233	.0780	2.7416	.0838	2.1660	.0651
28.(64)	2.4910	.0770	2.6255	.0803	2.2709	.0683
29.(65)	2.8469	.0880	2.9319	.0896	2.7078	.0814
30.(66)	2.3616	.0730	2.6994	.0825	1.8088	.0544
31.(67)	2.8792	.0890	2.9833	.0912	2.7089	.0814
32.(68)	2.0704	.0640	2.2893	.0700	1.7122	.0515
33.(69)	3.0086	.0930	3.1807	.0972	2.7269	.0820
34.(70)	2.1351	.0660	2.5781	.0788	1.4102	.0424
35.(71)	2.2645	.0700	2.7805	.0850	1.4201	.0427
36.(72)	2.6527	.0820	2.6716	.0817	2.6217	.0788
37.(73)	2.6851	.0830	2.8092	.0859	2.4821	.0746
38.(74)	2.4263	.0750	2.6146	.0799	2.1181	.0637
39.(75)	2.4586	.0760	2.6244	.0802	2.1873	.0657
40.(76)	2.3292	.0720	2.4878	.0761	2.0696	.0622
41.(77)	2.2645	.0700	2.3196	.0709	2.1743	.0653
42.(78)	2.3616	.0730	2.4375	.0745	2.2374	.0672

TABLE 2 -- Continued

SUPERVISORY RATING SCALE

	Factor I		Factor II, Position a		Factor II, Position b	
Item #	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight
43.(79)	2.1675	.0670	2.5137	.0769	1.6010	.0481
44.(80)	2.3939	.0740	2.7265	.0834	1.8496	.0556
45.(81)	2.1028	.0650	2.0557	.0629	2.1798	.0655
46.(82)	2.4586	.0760	2.6608	.0814	2.1278	.0640
47.(83)	2.5233	.0780	2.6115	.0798	2.3789	.0715
48.(84)	2.5233	.0780	2.8116	.0860	2.0515	.0617
49.(86)	2.5800	.0800	2.9261	.0895	2.0347	.0612
50.(87)	2.3616	.0730	2.6228	.0802	1.9341	.0581
51.(89)	2.2969	.0710	2.4261	.0742	2.0854	.0627
52.(90)	2.3616	.0730	2.5247	.0772	2.0947	.0630
53.(91)	2.1998	.0680	2.5457	.0778	1.6337	.0491
54.(92)	2.7498	.0850	2.8303	.0865	2.6180	.0787
55.(94)	2.2322	.0690	2.5110	.0768	1.7759	.0534
56.(95)	2.2322	.0690	2.3399	.0715	2.0560	.0618
57.(96)	2.8469	.0880	2.9495	.0902	2.6790	.0805
58.(97)	2.7822	.0860	3.0367	.0928	2.3657	.0711
59.(98)	2.2322	.0690	2.5505	.0780	1.7113	.0514
60.(99)	2.1675	.0670	2.6824	.0820	1.3249	.0398
61.(100)	2.2322	.0690	2.6215	.0801	1.5952	.0479
62.(101)	2.2322	.0690	2.7351	.0836	1.4092	.0424
63.(102)	1.7793	.0550	2.0687	.0632	1.3057	.0392
64.(103)	1.9734	.0610	2.4061	.0736	1.2653	.0380
65.(105)	1.6822	.0520	2.0512	.0627	1.0783	.0324
66.(106)	2.2322	.0690	3.6422	.1114	- .0750	-.0023
67.(107)	2.3292	.0720	2.7592	.0844	1.6256	.0489
68.(108)	2.5557	.0790	2.8255	.0864	2.1142	.0635
69.(109)	2.2645	.0700	2.7127	.0829	1.5310	.0460
70.(110)	2.3616	.0730	2.6957	.0824	1.8149	.0545
71.(111)	2.7175	.0840	2.8999	.0887	2.4191	.0727
72.(113)	2.2969	.0710	2.6474	.0809	1.7234	.0518
73.(114)	2.2645	.0700	2.5594	.0783	1.7819	.0536
74.(117)	2.4910	.0770	2.4847	.0760	2.5013	.0752
75.(119)	2.0704	.0640	2.2788	.0697	1.7293	.0520
76.(121)	1.8116	.0560	1.8493	.0565	1.7499	.0526
77.(122)	2.6851	.0830	2.9061	.0889	2.3235	.0698
78.(123)	2.7498	.0850	2.8336	.0866	2.6126	.0785
79.(125)	2.0057	.0620	2.3094	.0706	1.5087	.0453
80.(126)	1.9734	.0610	2.2607	.0691	1.5032	.0452
81.(127)	1.9087	.0590	2.3480	.0718	1.1898	.0358
82.(128)	2.1028	.0650	2.4915	.0762	1.4667	.0441
83.(129)	2.3292	.0720	2.5930	.0793	1.8976	.0570
84.(130)	2.4586	.0760	2.7273	.0834	2.0189	.0607

TABLE 2--Continued

SUPERVISORY RATING SCALE

	Factor I		Factor II, Position a		Factor II, Position b	
Item #	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight
85.(131)	2.4910	.0770	2.7296	.0835	2.1006	.0631
86.(133)	2.5880	.0800	2.4419	.0747	2.8270	.0850
87.(134)	2.5880	.0800	2.3682	.0724	2.9476	.0886
88.(135)	2.3616	.0730	2.4176	.0739	2.2700	.0682
89.(136)	1.4881	.0460	1.6359	.0500	1.2462	.0375
90.(137)	1.8763	.0580	1.7687	.0541	2.0523	.0617
91.(138)	2.6204	.0810	2.8420	.0869	2.2577	.0679
92.(139)	2.9439	.0910	2.9972	.0916	2.8566	.0859
93.(140)	2.8792	.0890	2.9165	.0892	2.8182	.0847

TABLE 3

RECORD RATING SCALE

Standard Scores and Weights from Factor Analysis of Experts' Ratings

	Factor I		Factor II, Position a		Factor II, Position b	
Item #	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight	Standard Score	Weight
1.	1.8440	.0570	1.4341	.0438	2.5147	.0756
2.	.9058	.0280	.5595	.0171	1.4724	.0443
3.	2.5233	.0780	2.1325	.0652	3.1628	.0951
4.	1.2617	.0390	.4959	.0152	2.5149	.0756
5.	2.5557	.0790	1.7266	.0528	3.9124	.1176
6.	2.8469	.0880	2.3117	.0707	3.7226	.1119
7.	2.4586	.0760	1.8667	.0571	3.4272	.1030
8.	1.2293	.0380	.7672	.0235	1.9855	.0597
9.	1.6822	.0520	1.2341	.0377	2.4155	.0726
10.	2.3292	.0720	1.7101	.0523	3.3422	.1005
11.	2.6527	.0820	2.0237	.0619	3.6819	.1107
12.	2.2645	.0700	1.8250	.0558	2.9836	.0897
13.	1.3587	.0420	1.0200	.0312	1.9129	.0575
14.	2.7822	.0860	2.3729	.0725	3.4520	.1037
15.	3.0410	.0940	2.5041	.0766	3.9196	.1178
16.	2.2322	.0690	1.7309	.0529	3.0525	.0917
17.	2.1351	.0660	1.5008	.0459	3.1730	.0954
18.	2.4263	.0750	2.0340	.0622	3.0682	.0922
19.	2.4586	.0760	1.8802	.0575	3.4050	.1023
20.	1.6499	.0510	.9625	.0294	2.7747	.0834
21.	2.0704	.0640	1.5451	.0472	2.9299	.0881
22.	2.3292	.0720	1.8154	.0555	3.1700	.0953
23.	1.7146	.0530	1.2613	.0386	2.4564	.0738
24.	2.0381	.0630	1.5891	.0486	2.7729	.0833
25.	1.9734	.0610	1.4842	.0454	2.7739	.0834
26.	2.4910	.0770	1.7212	.0526	3.7506	.1127
27.	1.5205	.0470	.7912	.0242	2.7139	.0816
28.	1.9734	.0610	1.3461	.0412	2.9999	.0902
29.	2.2645	.0700	1.7588	.0538	3.0920	.0929
30.	2.7498	.0850	1.9311	.0590	4.0895	.1229
31.	2.6204	.0810	1.9898	.0608	3.6523	.1098
32.	2.6204	.0810	1.9898	.0608	3.6523	.1098
33.	2.6527	.0820	1.8796	.0575	3.9177	.1177
34.	3.0410	.0940	2.4392	.0746	4.0258	.1210
35.	1.8440	.0570	1.3016	.0398	2.7316	.0821
36.	2.0057	.0620	1.3883	.0424	3.0160	.0906
37.	2.8792	.0890	2.1988	.0672	3.9925	.1200
38.	3.2351	.1000	2.6055	.0797	4.2654	.1282
39.	2.8469	.0880	2.1073	.0644	4.0572	.1219

TABLE 4

PRINCIPAL AXES FACTOR MATRIX

Experts	Factor I	Factor II
1	1.02	1.65
8	.87	1.34
2	1.06	.88
16	1.00	.86
11	1.21	.70
18	1.12	.67
13	.92	.58
14	1.21	.51
3	1.12	.45
12	.98	.39
7	1.25	.10
5	.90	- .07
15	.81	- .10
20	.76	- .40
9	1.10	- .42
17	.98	- .67
4	.68	-1.03
19	.85	-1.04
21	1.04	-1.69
6	.90	-1.70
10	.91	-2.08

Experts 7, 5, and 15 most nearly reflect the value pattern of Factor I, with loadings similar to all the other experts on Factor I, but with loadings closest to 0 on Factor II, indicating that they showed no particular preference for either of the two systems of values reflected by the experts at the extreme ends of Factor II.

Experts 1, 2, and 16 most nearly reflect the value pattern of the experts at the upper end of Factor II. Expert 8 was not included in this core position because he showed a high loading on a third factor which is not shown here since most of the other experts showed loadings near 0 on that factor. Therefore Expert 8 was considered too diversified to be included in a core position.

Experts 21, 6, and 10 best define the value pattern of the experts at the lower end of Factor II.

TABLE 5

CLASSIFICATION OF TASKS IN THE LICENSING OF FAMILY HOMES

Central Tasks (Standard Score > 2.5)	Peripheral Taks (Standard Score < 2.5)
I. Application	I. Application
A. Giving information concerning the licensing procedure to persons inquiring	A. Screening inquiries
1. giving information about requirements to be met and procedures to be followed; giving correct information; relating the information to the purposes of the inquirer; giving an adequate explanation in a helping rather than a threatening manner.	1. assessing whether applicant should be encouraged to continue with the application; helping inquirer to discontinue application procedure at this point if this seems advisable.
II. Study	II. Study
A. Conducting interviews	A. Displaying awareness of needs of children for normal growth and development
1. clearly define objectives for each interview; carry out interview as planned.	1. indicate awareness of psychological needs of children.
B. Displaying awareness of needs of children for normal growth and development	B. Displaying knowledge of standards
1. indicate awareness of physical needs of children.	1. indicate thorough knowledge of intangible standards as related to psychological requirements.

Central Tasks (Standard Score >2.5)	Peripheral Tasks (Standard Score <2.5)
II. Study (cont.) C. Displaying knowledge of standards 1. indicate thorough knowledge of tangible standards as related to physical requirements. 2. gather pertinent data concerning the physical resources of a home. D. Study and evaluation of resources of a given home by 1. applying criteria of "reasonable compliance"; applying standards consistently; considering perceptively the crucial factors in relation to the well-being of children. E. Study of a home for purposes of re-licensing 1. reviewing pertinent changes in the home. 2. re-evaluating its strengths and weaknesses.	II. Study (cont.) 2. gather pertinent data concerning the psychological resources of a home. C. Individualize family and household members as study progresses. D. Using references creatively as part of the licensing procedure 1. using references to the purpose of the study. 2. eliciting or confirming information. 3. relating material obtained to other data. 4. obtaining information from social service agencies concerning past contact of applicants.
III. Recommendation for issuance or non-issuance A. Arrive at a thoroughly considered recommendation and adequately support it by evidence in the record.	III. Recommendation for issuance or non-issuance A. Handling situations where the home is not licensable

Central Tasks (Standard Score > 2.5)	Peripheral Tasks (Standard Score < 2.5)
	III. Recommendation for issuance or non-issuance (cont.) 1. offer applicant opportunities to withdraw at her own initiative; minimize damage to the applicant resulting from this rejection. 2. reject a home at time of re-licensing.
IV. Supervision-Consultation	IV. Supervision-Consultation
	A. Giving advice or suggestions to applicant on licensee in dealing with specific problems related to independent foster care. 1. indicate awareness of when such help is needed; interpreting availability of such help; giving help that is useful and acceptable that will raise level of child care in the home.
	B. Handling complaint situations 1. assess motivation of complainant and the plausibility of the charge; discuss the complaint with complainant and with licensee with honesty and tactfulness.
	C. Using other agencies and community resources in behalf of licensee.

Central Tasks (Standard Score > 2.5)	Peripheral Tasks (Standard Score < 2.5)
	IV. Supervision-Consultation (cont.)
	1. display awareness of what resources are available; carry out appropriate refusals in a way acceptable to both person referred and agency referred to.
V. Establishing constructive relationships	V. Establishing constructive relationships
A. Concrete tasks in relationship building	A. Abstract or more clearly psychological tasks in relationship building
1. use vocabulary that can be readily understood by applicant and others.	1. accept the other person's feelings.
2. respect role of colleagues and of collateral personnel in relation to own role.	2. involve the other person as much as possible in the planning process.
3. work cooperatively with collateral personnel and colleagues.	3. start where other person is in the situation.
	4. use authority when necessary.
VI. Agency structure	VI. Agency structure
A. Developing professional identification consistent with role as licensing worker	A. Case recording
1. show comprehension of importance of his own function.	1. organize material to be covered to achieve maximum clarity of presentation.
	2. choose material that is clearly pertinent and sufficient to fulfill its purpose and record it so that it retains feeling tone.

Central Tasks (Standard Score > 2.5)	Peripheral Tasks (Standard Score < 2.5)
VI. Agency structure (cont.)	VI. Agency structure (cont.)
2. interpret agency responsibility for children in independent foster care and the agency as a "helping" as well as "regulatory" body.	3. display awareness of when letters are a sound instrument to use and compose them to fulfill a specific purpose. 4. use routine requirements (forms, etc.) creatively as part of the licensing process.
B. Case recording	B. Maintaining statistical records as required by agency
1. carry out recording according to routine of agency and on time.	1. display awareness of the importance of these reports and use to facilitate own work.
2. complete routine requirements (forms, etc.) on time and accurately.	2. make suggestions for the improvement of these reports.
C. Planning work load	
1. make plans that meet needs of specific case.	
2. make realistic plans for use of time.	
D. Maintaining statistical records as required by agency	
1. complete reports accurately and on time.	
E. Using supervision	
1. indicate awareness of when help is needed; use it when offered to improve level of own performance.	

Central Tasks (Standard Score >2.5)	Peripheral Tasks (Standard Score <2.5)
VII. Work with natural parents of children in independent foster care	VII. Work with natural parents of children in independent foster care
	A. Display awareness of the importance of the natural parent's role and of the needs of the parent.
	B. Render services to natural parents as needed.
VIII. Community organization aspects of licensing	VIII. Community organization aspects of licensing
	A. Community education
	1. choose material for interpretation that meets needs of another organization or individual.
	2. prepare and communicate material for use by other community organizations or individuals.
	3. work through proper agency channels in carrying out community organizations tasks of licensing.
	4. interpret regulations, philosophy, and procedures of licensing homes to the community through newspaper articles, talks with community groups, etc.
	B. Reformulation of standards
	1. Evaluate application of standards with possible revision of minimal standards as an objective

TABLE 6

SAMPLE COMPUTATIONS FOR EVALUATION OF WORKER PERFORMANCE

Table 4 on the following page illustrates how the particular position chosen as the standard determines the extent to which specific trainees meet or surpass the minimum standard of competence. For each of the three value patterns of Factor I and II, there is a set of standard scores and corresponding weights, one for each item of the two scales. (See Tables 2 and 3, pp. 164-167.) Performance scores on six sample items for hypothetical Trainees A and B are shown as well as the difference for each trainee between his performance score and the standard score for each of the six items. Weights were then applied by multiplying each difference by the weight for that item.

Note that Trainees A and B had the same total performance scores. However, because the central tasks of licensing were weighted most heavily (represented in the table by Items 46 and 58), it was apparent that Trainee A, whose high scores fell in these areas, more than met the minimum standard of competence, while Trainee B, whose high scores fell elsewhere, did not. Had a different value pattern been chosen, the outcomes for the trainees might have been reversed.

Note further that for each item there was a theoretical maximum and minimum score. Accordingly, a trainee's score can be interpreted in three ways: in its distance from the maximum obtainable, in its distance from the minimum possible score, and in its distance from the minimum level of competence. Scores could be combined for all items of the two scales or for any desired subgrouping, or the scales could be shortened by eliminating items.

TABLE 6

SAMPLE COMPUTATIONS FOR EVALUATION WORKER PERFORMANCE

Item	Standard Score	Weight	Maximum Score[a]	Minimum Score[b]	Worker A Performance Score	Worker A Difference Score[c]	Worker A Weighted Difference Score[d]	Worker B Performance Score	Worker B Difference Score[c]	Worker B Weighted Difference Score[d]
46. Is trainee able to work cooperatively with colleagues?	3.07	.95	.88	-2.92	3.75	+.68	+.65	1.00	-2.07	-2.00
58. Is trainee able to give correct information about licensing procedures to persons inquiring?	3.23	1.00	.77	-3.23	4.00	+.77	+.77	1.00	-2.23	-2.23
102. Is trainee able to give acceptable consultation to foster parents even when it was not requested?	1.77	.55	1.23	- .97	1.00	- .77	-.42	1.25	- .52	- .29
121. Is trainee able to render services as needed to natural parents of children in foster care?	1.81	.56	1.23	-1.01	1.25	- .56	-.31	1.00	- .81	- .45
142. Recording--Source of referral	.91	.28	.87	- .25	.90	- .01	-.003	4.00	+3.09	.86
143. Recording--Applicant's attitude towards licensing	1.26	.39	1.07	- .49	1.10	- .16	-.06	3.75	+2.49	+1.00
Total Maximum and Minimum Scores			6.05	-8.87						
Total Raw Performance Score					12.00			12.00		
Total Weighted Difference Scores (Overall level of competence in performance)							+.63[e]			-3.11[e]

[a] Maximum score for each item obtained by subtracting standard score from the maximum score obtainable (4), and multiplying the result by the weight.

[b] Minimum score for each item obtained by subtracting standard score from the minimum score obtainable (0), and multiplying the result by the weight.

[c] Difference score obtained by subtracting standard score from performance score.

[d] Weighted difference score obtained by multiplying difference score by weight for that item.

competence in performance = 0.

TABLE 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINEES

(N = 41 Trainees)

Characteristic	Training Method I	Training Method II		Training Method III	Totals
		State A	State B[a]		
	N = 8	N = 10	N = 3	N = 20	41
Age					
Range	21-52	21-56	21-24	21-58	21-58
Mean	33.5	33.7	22.3	35.1	33.5
S.D.	13.2	13.5	1.2	10.8	11.9
Education					
No. with less than A.B.	1	7	0	3	11
No. with A.B. degree	7	3	3	17	30
Social Work Experience					
No. with	3	2	0	12	17
No. without	5	8	3	8	24
School and College Ability Test (SCAT)					
Mean	23.8[b]	20.9[b]	24.3	20.9[b]	
S.D.	4.2	4.8		5.5	
Parental Attitude Research Instrument[c]					
Authoritarian-control					
Mean	150.1	145.0	151.0	139.0	
S.D.	27.1	19.2	12.0	17.5	
Hostile-rejecting					
Mean	62.0	61.2	53.5	65.3	
S.D.	10.7	9.5	9.5	13.2	
Democratic					
Mean	50.8	51.2	49.5	51.7	
S.D.	5.4	9.5	.5	4.1	

---

[a] No statistical tests of comparison with the other groups were carried out because of the very small number of trainees in State B.

[b] Means did not differ significantly ($F < 1$).

[c] Means did not differ significantly ($F < 1$). Means are based on females only, since there were very few men among the trainees in each group. "N" of female subjects were: I=7; II, State A=9; State B=2; III=18.

TABLE 8

PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

A Comparison of Scores of Three Groups of Students

Factor	Trainees (N=36)		Social Work Students (N=27)		Education Students (N=23)	
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.
Authoritarian-control	144.0	21.3	137	18.5	155.4	22.1
Hostile-rejecting	63.0	12.0	64.9	8.4	61.9	8.8
Democratic	51.3	4.5	50.5	5.4	51.4	7.7

No significant differences were found between mean scores of the trainees and either of the other two groups.

TABLE 9

CONTENT EXAMINATION

Summary of Results

Demonstration Group	Before Training		After Training		Mean Gain in Score
	Mean Score	S.D.	Mean Score	S.D.	
Training Method I (N=8)	197.9	6.3	216.6	6.4	18.7*
Training Method II					
State A (N=10)	57.7	7.0	75.7	11.4	18.0*
State B (N= 3)	60.3	--	85.0	--	24.7
Training Method III (N=20)	66.0	12.3	85.4	11.5	19.4*

NOTE: Maximum score possible on examination taken by Training Method I was 250. Maximum score possible for examination taken by other groups was 100.

Because there were only three persons in State B, no test of significance for gain was carried out.

* $p < .001$

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF SUPERVISORY RATING SCALE

Achievement of Trainee Groups on the Various Categories of Central and Peripheral Tasks

Category	No. of Items	Training Method I			Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
					State A			State B								
		(N=8)			(N=10)			(N=3)			(N=20)			(N=41)		
		Pct. of Trainees			Pct. of Trainees			Pct. of Trainees			Pct. of Trainees			Pct. of Trainees		
Central Tasks		+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
I. Application	6	75%	25%		70%	30%		100			90%	10%		83%	17%	
II. Study	10	75	25		90	10		100			85	15		85	15	
III. Recommendation	3	87.5	12.5		70	30		100			80	20		80	20	
V. Establishing Relationships	6	75	25		80	20		100			85	15		83	17	
VI. Agency Structure	15	62.5	37.5		70	30		100			85	15		78	22	
Overall Score*	40	75	25		80	20		100			90	10		85	15	
Peripheral Tasks																
I. Application	2	87.5		12.5	90	10		100			90	5	5	90	5	5
II. Study	8	87.5	12.5		80	20		100			85	15		85	15	
III. Recommendation	3	100			70	20	10	33		67	65	10	25	71	10	19
IV. Supervision-Consultation	15	87.5	12.5		90		10	100			90	5	5	90	5	5
V. Establishing Relationships	5	87.5	12.5		90	10		100			75	25		83	17	
VI. Agency Structure	10	75	25		70	30		100			85	15		80	20	
VII. Natural Parents	3	25	12.5	62.5	30	10	60	67		33	35	10	55	34	10	56
VIII. Community Organization	4	62.5		37.5	40	20	40	67		33	40	10	50	46	10	44
Overall Score*	53	87.5	12.5		90	10		100			95	5		93	7	

NOTE: + achieved minimal level of competence
- failed to achieve minimal level of competence
x trainees rated "no basis for judgment" for all items in that category

*Each trainee's overall score consisted of the sum of his weighted difference scores for all the central items or all the peripheral items. If the sum was 0 or above, he attained at or above the minimal level of competence.

TABLE

SUPERVISORY

Ratings of Trainee Groups

(Trainees were rated at or above a level of minimal competence;-Trainees were rated

Category		Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees +	-	x
. **Application**		75	25	
Item #21-(56)	Is trainee able to: Give information concerning requirements to be met for the purposes of obtaining a license, i.e., standards, etc.?	87.5	12.5	
22-(57)	Give information concerning procedures to be followed?	62.5	37.5	
23-(58)	Give correct information?	75	25	
24-(59)	Relate information to the purposes of the inquirer?	100		
25-(60)	Give information in a helping rather than in a threatening manner?	75	25	
26-(61)	Present the information with a rationale that gives an adequate explanation?	100		
. **Study**		75	25	
Item #27-(63)	Is trainee able to: Clearly define objectives for each interview?	75	25	
28-(64)	Carry out defined interviewing objectives?	87.5	12.5	
29-(65)	Indicate awareness of the physical needs of children?	87.5	12.5	
31-(67)	Indicate through knowledge of tangible standards as related to physical requirements?	87.5	12.5	
33-(69)	Gather data concerning the physical resources of a home?	75	25	
36-(72)	Evaluate a home in relation to state standards by applying the criteria of "reasonable compliance"?	75	25	
37-(73)	Evaluate a home in relation to state standards by applying the standards consistently?	87.5	12.5	
38-(74)	Evaluate a home in relation to the needs of children by considering perceptively the crucial factors in relation to the well-being of children?	87.5	12.5	
77-(122)	Review all the pertinent changes of the past year (or of whatever time period has elapsed since last study)?	50	12.5	37.5
78-(123)	Re-evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the home in terms of meeting minimum standards?	50	12.5	37.5

11

RATING SCALE

on Central Tasks Within Categories

below level of minimal competence; x No basis for supervisory judgment)

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			n=20 % of Trainees			n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
70	30		100			90	10		82.9	17.1	
70	30		100			85	15		82.9	17.1	
70	30		100			80	20		75.6	24.4	
70	30		100			70	30		73.2	26.8	
70	30		100			95	5		90.2	9.8	
60	40		100			75	25		73.2	26.8	
70	30		33	67		95	5		85.4	14.6	
90	10		100			85	15			14.6	
80	20		67	33		75	25		75.6	24.4	
80	20		100			80	20		82.9	17.1	
60	40		100			95	5		85.4	14.6	
90	10		100			90	10		90.2	9.8	
70	30		67	33		75	25		73.2	26.8	
70	30		33	67		90	10		78.0	21.9	
90	10		100			95	5		92.7	7.3	
90	10		100			80	20		85.4	14.6	
20	10	70	100			70	15	15	56.1	12.2	31.7
30		70	100			75	10	15	61.0	7.3	31.7

Category		Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees +	-	x
III. Recommendation		87.5	12.5	
Item #47-(83)	Is trainee able to: Arrive at a thoroughly considered recommendation?	62.5	37.5	
48-(84)	Adequately support this recommendation by the evidence in the record?	62.5	37.5	
71-(111)	Gather pertinent information to support a recommendation to object a given home in relation to the inability of the home to meet minimum standards?	100		
V. Establishing Constructive Relationships		75	25	
Item #5 -(7)	Is trainee able to: Communicate effectively by using vocabulary that can be readily understood by the applicant?	75	25	
10-(18)	Communicate effectively by using vocabulary that can be readily understood by applicant's family?	62.5	25	12.5
13-(40)	Alleviate resistance; i.e., anxiety, hostility by respecting the other person's role in relation to his own?	100		
14-(45)	Work cooperatively with collateral persons?	100		
15-(46)	Work cooperatively with colleagues?	87.5	12.5	
16-(48)	Respect the other person's roles in relation to his own?	87.5	12.5	
VI. Agency Structure		62.5	37.5	
Item #17-(50)	Is Trainee able to: Show in carrying out his tasks that he regards the licensing procedure as worthwhile?	75	25	
18-(51)	Indicate comprehension of the importance of his own function?	75	25	
19-(52)	Interpret the agency's responsibility for children in independent foster care as related to the licensing procedure?	87.5		12.5
20-(53)	Interpret the agency as a "helping" as well as an "authoritarian" body?	87.5	12.5	
49-(86)	Organize the material to be covered according to the routine of the agency?	37.5	62.5	
54-(92)	Complete the recordings at the time required by the agency?	37.5	62.5	
57-(96)	Get these requirements fulfilled on time?	62.5	37.5	
58-(97)	Complete these forms accurately or see to it that these forms are completed accurately by others?	100		

Continued

Training Method II State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			Training Method III n=20 % of Trainees			All Trainees n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
60	40		100			80	20		78.0	21.9	
90	10		100			85	15		82.9	17.1	
60	40		100			80	20		73.2	26.8	
60	30	10	33		67	50	20	30	61.0	17.1	21.9
80	20		100			85	15		82.9	17.1	
70	30		100			80	20		78.0	21.9	
80	10	10	100			70	20	10	73.2	17.1	9.8
60		40	67		33	75	10	15	75.6	4.9	19.5
50	10	40	67		33	75	10	15	73.2	7.3	19.5
60	40		100			75	25		75.6	24.4	
80	20		100			90	10		87.8	12.2	
70	30		100			85	15		78.0	21.9	0
60	40		100			85	15		78.0	21.9	
80	20		67	33		80	20		78.0	21.9	
60	30	10	67	33		70	5	25	70.7	12.2	17.1
90	10		67	33		85	5	10	85.4	9.8	4.9
80	20		100			90	10		78.0	21.9	
80	20		100			70	30		68.3	31.7	
50	50		67	33		75	25		65.9	34.1	
60	40		100			85	15		82.9	17.1	

TABLE 11--

Category	Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees +	 -	 X
V. Agency Structure Continued			
84-(130) Make plans that meet the needs of the specific case?	75	25	
85-(131) Make plans for the use of time that are realistic?	62.5	37.5	
86-(133) Complete these reports accurately?	62.5	37.5	
87-(134) Hand the reports in on time?	75	25	
91-(138) Indicate awareness of when he needs supervisory help?	87.5	12.5	
92-(139) Accept supervision when it is offered?	75	25	
93-(140) Use it to improve the level of own performance?	75	25	

Continued

Training Method II State A n=10 % of Trainees +			State B n=3 % of Trainees +			Training Method III n=20 % of Trainees +			All Trainees n=41 % of Trainees +		
	-	x		-	x		-	x		-	x
90		10	100			75	25		80.5	17.1	2.4
80	10	10	100			80	20		78.0	19.5	2.4
40	20	40	100			100			78.0	12.2	9.8
50	10	40	100			90	10		78.0	12.2	9.8
90.	10		67	33		80	20		82.9	17.1	
80	20		100			80	20		80.4	19.5	
80	20		100			75	25		78.0	21.9	

TABLE

SUPERVISORY

Ratings of Trainee Groups

(+Trainees were rated at or above a level of minimal competence; -Trainees were rated

Category			Training Method I N=8 % of Trainees +	-	x
I. Application			87.5		12.5
	Item #1	Is the trainee able to: Assess whether applicant should be encouraged to continue with the application?	87.5		12.5
	2	Help inquirer to discontinue application procedure at this point if this seems advisable?	87.5		12.5
II. Study			87.5	12.5	
	Item #30-(66)	Is the trainee able to: Indicate awareness of the psychological needs of children?	75	25	
	32-(68)	Indicate through knowledge of intangible standards as related to psychological requirements?	87.5	12.5	
	34-(70)	Gather a sufficient amount of pertinent data concerning the psychological resources of a home?	75	25	
	35-(71)	Individualize pertinent family and household members?	75	25	
	39-(75)	Use references when they are necessary to the purpose of the study?	75	12.5	12.5
	40-(76)	Use references to elicit or confirm material that they are in a position to offer?	62.5	25.0	12.5
	41-(77)	Relate material obtained from references to other data on a case?	75	12.5	12.5
	44-(80)	To obtain information concerning past contact of applicant with social service agencies?	75		25
III. Recommendation			100		
	Item #72-(113)	Is the trainee able to: Offer the applicant one or more acceptable opportunities to withdraw at her own initiative?	100		
	73-(114)	Minimize the damage to the applicant resulting from this rejection?	50	12.5	37.5
	79-(125)	Reject a home at this time if it seems warranted by the above information?	25	12.5	62.5

12

RATING SCALE

on Peripheral Tasks Within Categories

below level of minimal competence; x No basis for supervisory judgment)

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			n=20 % of Trainees			n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
90	10		100			95	5		92.7	4.9	2.4
80	20		100			80	15	5	82.9	12.2	4.9
70	20	10	100			85	10	5	82.9	9.8	7.3
80	20		100			85	15		85.4	14.6	
70	30		100			80	20		78.0	21.9	
70	30		100			80	20		80.5	19.5	
70	30		100			90	10		82.9	17.1	
60	40		100			80	20		75.6	24.4	
80	20		67		33	75	20	5	75.6	17.1	7.3
90	10		67		33	70	25	5	73.2	19.5	7.3
70	30		67		33	75	25		73.2	21.9	4.9
60	10	30	100			50	25	25	61.0	14.6	24.3
70	20	10	33		67	65	10	24	70.7	9.8	19.5
50	40	10	33		67	60	10	30	63.4	14.6	21.9
50	40	10	33		67	55	5	40	51.2	14.6	34.1
30		70	33		67	50	5	45	39.0	4.9	56.1

Category		Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees +	 -	 x
V..Supervision-Consultation		87.5	12.5	
Item #60-(99)	Is trainee able to: Indicate awareness of when such help is necessary?	87.5	12.5	
61-(100)	Interpret to the applicant the availability of such help?	87.5	12.5	
62-(101)	Give help that is useful to the person who requested it?	87.5	12.5	
63-(102)	Give help that is acceptable even when it was not specifically requested?	87.5		12.5
64-(103)	Use opportunities to offer this help in order to help raise the level of child care being offered in the home?	75	12.5	12.5
65-(105)	Assess the motivation of the complainant in making this charge?	50		50
66-(106)	Assess the plausibility of the charge in view of the total situation?	50	12.5	37.5
67-(107)	Discuss the complaint with the complainant with a high degree of honesty?	37.5	25	37.5
68-(108)	Discuss the complaint with the complainant in a tactful manner?	37.5	25	37.5
69-(109)	Discuss the complaint with the person complained about with a high degree of honesty?	37.5	25	37.5
70-(110)	Discuss the complaint with the person complained about in a tactful manner?	37.5	25	37.5
42-(78)	Display awareness of what resources are available?	87.5	12.5	
43-(79)	Use these resources discriminately to carry out referrals?	62.5	12.5	25
45-(81)	Make these referrals acceptable to the persons referred for service?	25	25	50
46-(82)	Make these referrals acceptable to the agencies to whom persons are referred?	37.5	12.5	50
V.- Establishing Constructive Relationships		87.5	12.5	
Item #3-(4)	Is trainee able to: Alleviate resistance; i.e., anxiety, hostility by accepting the other person's feelings?	75	25	
4-(6)	Alleviate resistance; i.e., anxiety, hostility by involving the other as much as possible in the planning process?	62.5	37.5	
6-(9)	Communicate effectively by starting where the other person is?	50	37.5	12.5
7-(12)	Communicate effectively by using authority when necessary?	62.5	37.5	
8-(16)	Alleviate resistance; i.e., anxiety, hostility by accepting the other person's feelings?	87.5		12.5

Continued . .

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			n=20 % of Trainees			n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
90		10	100			90	5	5	90.2	4.9	4.9
80	10	10	100			70	10	20	78.0	9.8	12.2
90		10	100			70	10	20	80.5	7.3	12.2
80	10	10	100			60	15	25	73.2	12.2	14.6
80	10	10	67		33	75	5	20	78.0	4.9	17.1
90	10	10	100			75	5	20	80.5	4.9	14.6
40		60	67		33	50		50	48.8	0	51.2
30	10	60	67		33	40	10	50	41.5	9.8	48.8
40		60	67		33	45	5	50	43.9	7.3	48.8
30	10	60	67		33	40	10	50	39.0	12.2	48.8
40		60	67		33	40	10	50	41.5	9.8	48.8
40		60	67		33	40	10	50	41.5	9.8	48.8
30	40	30	100			50	40	10	56.1	31.7	12.2
50	10	40	100			55	20	25	58.5	14.6	26.8
60		40	100			50	10	40	51.2	9.8	39.0
60		40	67		33	45	10	45	48.8	7.3	43.9
90	10		100			75	25		82.9	17.1	
100			100			75	25		82.9	17.1	
60	40		100			80	20		73.2	26.8	
80	20		100			65	35		68.3	29.3	2.4
30	50	20	100			60	35	5	56.1	36.6	7.3
80		20	100			65	20	15	76.6	9.8	14.6

TABLE 12--

	Category	Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees		
		+	-	x
V.	Establishing Constructive Relationships, Continued			
Item #9-(18)	Is trainee able to: Alleviate resistance; i.e., anxiety, hostility by involving the other person as much as possible in the planning process?	50	37.5	12.5
11-(21)	Communicate effectively by starting where the other person is?	37.5	37.5	25
12-(24)	Communicate effectively by using authority when necessary?	37.5	50	12.5
VI.	Agency Structure	75	25	
Item #50-(87)	Is trainee able to: Organize the material to be covered so that he will achieve maximum clarity of presentation?	50	50	
51-(89)	Choose material to be included in the record such that the material selected is clearly pertinent?	62.5	37.5	
52-(90)	Choose material to be included in the record such that the material in the record is sufficient to fulfill its purpose?	75	25	
53-(91)	Choose material to be included in the record such that the feeling tone is retained along with the associated data?	62.5	37.5	
55-(94)	Display awareness of when letters would be a sound instrument to use?	62.5	37.5	
56-(95)	Compose letters in such a way that they fulfill their specific purpose?	62.5	37.5	
59-(98)	Use these requirements creatively as part of the licensing process?	62.5	37.5	
88-(135)	Display awareness of the importance of these reports?	50	50	
89-(136)	Add comments and/or suggestions for improving these reports?	62.5	37.5	
90-(137)	Use these reports to facilitate own work?	50	50	
VII.	Working with Natural Parents	25	12.5	62.5
Item #74-(117)	Is trainee able to: Display an awareness of the nature of the role of the child's natural parents, by recognizing the importance of the natural parent(s) in independent foster care situation?	25	12.5	62.5
75-(119)	Display an awareness of the nature of the role of the child's natural parents, by recognizing the needs of natural parents in the independent foster care situation?	25	12.5	62.5
76-(121)	Render services to natural parents as needed?	12.5	12.5	75

Continued

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A			State B								
n=10			n=3			n=20			n=41		
% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
50	30	20	67		33	65	20	15	58.5	24.4	17.1
70	20	10	100			70	20	10	65.8	21.9	12.2
40	40	20	100			75	10	15	61.0	24.4	14.6
70	30		100			85	15		80.5	19.5	
70	30		100			75	25		70.7	29.2	
60	40		100			70	30		68.3	31.7	
50	50		100			65	35		65.8	34.1	
50	50		100			70	30		65.8	34.1	
50	20	30	67		33	70	15	15	63.4	19.5	17.1
50	20	30	67		33	70	15	15	63.4	19.5	17.1
70	30		67	33		85	15		75.6	24.4	
50	10	40	100			75	5	20	65.8	14.6	19.5
40	10	50	67		33	55	15	30	53.7	17.1	29.2
50	10	40	100			75	5	20	65.8	14.6	19.5
30	10	60	67		33	35	10	55	34.1	9.8	56.1
30	10	60	67		33	35	10	55	34.1	9.8	56.1
40		60	67		33	40	5	55	39.0	4.9	56.1
30	10	60	67		33	30	5	65	29.3	7.3	63.4

TABLE 12--

		Training Method I		
		n=8 % of Trainees		
	Category	+	-	x
VIII.	Community Organization Activities	62.5		37.5
Item #80-(126)	Is trainee able to: Choose material that meets the needs of the specific community organization or individual?	62.5		37.5
81-(127)	Prepare the material for use by or for community organizations or individuals?	62.5		37.5
82-(128)	Communicate the desired material?	62.5		37.5
83-(129)	Work through proper agency channels in fulfilling this function?	62.5		37.5

Continued

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			n=20 % of Trainees			n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
40	20	40	67		33	40	10	50	46.3	9.8	43.9
50	10	40	67		33	45	5	50	51.2	4.9	43.9
50	10	40	67		33	45	5	50	51.2	4.9	43.9
40	20	40	67		33	40	10	50	46.3	9.8	43.9
30	30	40	67		33	35	15	50	41.5	14.6	43.9

TABLE 13

SUPERVISORS' LIST OF TASKS WITH WHICH TRAINEES NEEDED MOST HELP

Category of Tasks	No. of Times Cited				
	Method 1	Method 2		Method 3	Total
		State A	State B		
I. Application	1		1		2
II. Study	1	3	3	14	21
III. Recommendation	1	3		3	7
IV. Supervision-consultation			2	5	7
V. Establishing Relationships	4	4	2	4	14
VI. Agency Structure	14	6	2	14	36
VII. Interfering Personal Problems of Trainee	5	1		8	14

TABLE 14

SITUATIONAL TEST

Achievement of Trainee Groups

Questions	Training Group 1 n= 8 % of Trainees		II--State A n= 9 % of Trainees		III n= 20 % of Trainees		All Trainees n= 37 % of Trainees	
Related to Central Tasks	+	−	+	−	+	−	+	−
1. Application - equipment problem	87.5%	12.5%	66.6%	33.3%	95%	5%	84%	16%
7. Study - physical plant problem	100	0	55.5	44.4	65	35	74	26
Related to Peripheral Tasks								
2. Consultation to foster mother	75	25	33.3	66.6	65	35	58	42
3. Application - intangible psychological problem	75	25	55.5	44.4	70	30	66	34
4. Application - problem of psychological health of applicant	87.5	12.5	77.7	22.2	75	25	76	24
5. Consultation - handling of separation	75	25	22.2	77.7	75	25	60	40
6. Supervision - complaint situation	62.5	37.5	0	100	30	70	29	71
*Overall score	75.0	25.0	11	89	70	30	57	43

+ achieved minimal level of competence
- failed to achieve minimal level of competence

*To receive an overall score denoting a level of minimal competence or above, trainees had to achieve at or above a level of minimal competence on at least five of the seven items.

Scores could not be obtained for one trainee in State A (hence the number of trainees is reported as 9) nor for any of the three trainees in State B.

TABLE 15

EXPERIMENTAL INTERVIEW

Percentage Agreement Between Raters
on Two Sets of 8 Interviews

Purposes	Level of Agreement					
	Complete		1 Step		Disagreement*	
	1st Set	2nd Set	1st Set	2nd Set	1st Set	2nd Set
1. Interpret Law	50%	50%	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	12.5%
2. Role of Agency	25	50	62.5	25	12.5	25
3. Requirements of Procedure	12.5	75	87.5	12.5	0	12.5
4. Standards	0	62.5	62.5	25	37.5	12.5
5. Motivation of Applicant	25	37.5	62.5	50	12.5	12.5
6. Capacity to Meet Children's Needs	50	37.5	25	37.5	25	25
7. Factual Information	62.5	50	25	50	12.5	0
8. Relationship	25	25	25	50	50	25
9. Notes	12.5	25	50	62.5	37.5	12.5
10. Techniques of Interviewing	62	50	34	44	4	6

*Defined as a difference between judges of more than one step, or interval.

TABLE 16

TRAINEES' MEAN SCORES ON EXPERIMENTAL INTERVIEWS:

Training Method I
(N = 8)

Item	1st Interview	2nd Interview
	Mean Score	Mean Score
1. Interpreting law	3.4	2.9
2. Interpreting role of agency	2.8	3.2
3. Interpreting licensing procedures	2.6	2.8
4. Interpreting standards	3.3	3.7
5. Exploring motives	3.8	3.5
6. Exploring capacity to meet needs of children	4.0	2.6
7. Eliciting factual data	3.1	3.9
8. Developing relationship	3.4	3.2
9. Notes	3.5	3.9
10. Techniques of Interviewing	21.2	22.1

NOTE: Mean scores, as shown above, were determined as follows: Item scores for each trainee were determined by averaging the ratings of the two judges; then, mean scores for each item were computed on the basis of the total scores of the eight trainees for that item.

The first eight items, relating to purposes of the interview, were scored on a five point scale with minimal adequacy at level three.

The one item relating to notes was scored on a five point scale with minimal adequacy at level three.

The twelve items relating to interviewing techniques were rated on a three point scale. A score of 19 constitutes overall minimal adequacy on interviewing techniques. (See Appendix A, pp. 51 and 52 for further description of interviewing technique items and scoring system.)

TABLE 17

PERCENTAGE AGREEMENT OF TWO JUDGES ON RATING SCALE FOR 19 LIVE INITIAL INTERVIEWS

Item Judged	Absolute Agreement	Agreement on Minimal Adequacy*
1. To give an interpretation of the licensing law, its meaning or purpose, the basis for the right of the state to license.	53%	63%
2. To interpret what a standard is and test the ability or readiness of the applicant to cooperate in meeting standards.	69	74
3. To explore tentatively the motivation of the applicant's plan to give child care. (What does the applicant want to do, and why?)	63	95
4. To explore what the applicant is able to do (includes beginning exploration of her capacity to meet the needs of children).	69	100
5. To clarify as needed the procedures of licensing, the nature of the requirements or expectations, the role of the agency.	63	100
6. To lay a basis for a constructive working relationship with the applicant.	79	100
Mean agreement on all six items	66	89

*A rating of 2 or 3 on a given item was considered at or above a minimally adequate level for meeting agency responsibility. A rating of 0 or 1 was below that level. Therefore, if one judge rated 2 and another judge rated 3 on a given item, or similarly if one judge rated 0 and another rated 1 on a given item, this constituted agreement on the question of minimal adequacy. However, if one judge rated 1 and another rated 2 on a given item, this constituted disagreement on the question of minimal adequacy.

TABLE 18

TRAINEE SCORES ON INITIAL INTERVIEWS: TRAINING METHOD III

(N = 19)

Tasks	Mean Score
1. Interpret Licensing Law	1.7
2. Interpret Standards	2.1
3. Explore Motivation	2.1
4. Explore Capacity for Child Care	2.3
5. Clarify Procedures	2.4
6. Lay Basis for Constructive Relationship	2.6
Final Score	2.3

NOTE: A trainee's score on any item represents the pooled ratings of two judges for that item.

A trainee's final score was computed by totaling the pooled ratings of the two judges on each item and dividing by the number of items rated. The trainee must have performed at least four of the stated six tasks to be eligible for final evaluation of minimally adequate or above minimally adequate. Fewer tasks than that would disqualify him regardless of how well he performed whatever tasks he did. A final score 1.7 was considered to be below minimal adequacy; a final score of 1.7 - 2.4 was considered to be within the range of minimal adequacy; a final score 2.4 was considered to be above the level that would meet agency responsibility minimally. Mean scores shown on the table were computed on the basis of the total scores for the 19 trainees for that item.

TABLE 19

RECORD RATING SCALE

Percentage Agreement Between Two Independent Judges on 98 Records

Category	No. of Items	Average	Percentage	Agreement
		Complete	1 Step Diff.	Disagreement*
I. Summary of case activity	1	63.2	18.4	18.4
II. Request for service	4	56.1	32.9	11.0
III. Applicant's expectations of natural parents	3	69.7	19.4	11.9
IV. Child Care Services to be provided	5	73.6	17.9	8.1
V. Characteristics of foster mother	3	55.8	39.1	5.1
VI. Characteristics of foster father	4	54.6	28.8	16.6
VII. Description of foster family's own children	2	52.0	27.0	20.9
VIII. Description of others living in applicant's household	3	89.1	2.7	8.16
IX. Description of foster family as a whole	3	66.6	21.7	11.55
X. Description of physical plant	6	63.9	29.6	6.46
XI. Material from references	2	76.5	18.4	5.1
XII. Overall evaluation and recommendation	3	65.9	26.9	7.1
Total	39	65.5	24.4	10.0

*Defined as a difference between judges of more than one interval or a disagreement involving a "not applicable" rating.

TABLE 20

RESULTS FROM THE EVALUATION OF CASE RECORDS

Achievement of Trainee Groups on the Various Categories of Record Content

Category	No. of items	Training Method I (n=8) % of Trainees			Training Method II State A (n= 10) % of Trainees			Training Method II State B (n=3) % of Trainees			Training Method III (n=18)* % of Trainees			All Trainees (n=39) % of Trainees		
		+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
1. Summary of case activity	1	75	25		90	10		100	0	0	55.5	44.5		71.8	28.2	0
2. Request for service	4	50	50		60	40		100	0	0	38.8	61.2		51.3	48.7	0
3. Applicant's expectations of natural parents	3	0	100		40	60		67	33	0	0	100		15.4	84.6	0
4. Child Case Services to be provided	5	0	100		10	90		0	100	0	0	100		2.6	97.4	0
5. Characteristics of foster mother	3	0	100		0	100		0	100	0	0	100		0	100	0
6. Characteristics of foster father	4	0	100		10	80	10	0	100	0	5.5	89	5.5	5.1	89.7	5.1
7. Description of own children in applicant's home	2	0	100		30	70		33	67	0	16.6	77.9	5.5	17.9	79.5	2.6
8. Description of others living in household	3	12.5	12.5	75	0	10	90	0	0	100	16.6	5.5	77.9	7.7	7.7	84.6

TABLE 20 -- Continued

Category	No. of Items	Training Method I			Training Method II State A			Training Method II State B			Training Method III			All Trainees		
		(n=8)			(n=10)			(n=3)			(n=18)*			(n=39)		
		% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees		
		+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
9. Description of foster family as a whole	3	0	100		0	100		0	100	0	0	100		0	100	0
10. Description of physical plant	6	0	100		0	100		0	100	0	0	100		0	100	0
11. Material from reference	2	50	50		60	40		33	67		33.3	66.7		43.6	56.4	0
12. Overall evaluation and recommendation	3	0	100		0	100		0	100	0	0	100		0	100	0
Overall Score**	39	0	100		0	100		0	100	0	0	100		0	100	0

+ Achieved minimal level of competence
- Failed to achieve minimal level of competence
x Trainees rated "no basis for judgment" for all items in that category.

* Eighteen of the twenty trainees in this group submitted for evaluation records of initial licensing studies.

** Each trainee's overall score consisted of the sum of his weighted difference scores for all the items. If the sum was 0 or above, he attained at or above the minimal level of competence.

TABLE

RECORD RATING

Achievement of Trainee Groups on

(+achieved at or above level of minimal competence; - failed

Category	Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees		
	+	-	x
I. Summary of Case Activity	75	25	
Item:			
1. Dates and place of interviews, names of interviewees, whether in person or by telephone	75	25	
II. Request for Service	50	50	
Item:			
2. Source of referral	100	0	
3. Nature of the request	37.5	62.5	
4. Attitude toward licensing	75	25	
5. Motivation for applying	0	100	
III. Applicant's Expectations of Natural Parents	0	100	
Item:			
6. Concrete expectations of natural parents; e.g., days and hours of care, fees, etc.	0	100	
7. Knowledge about child parents are expected to provide	0	100	
8. Other expectations of natural parents	0	100	
IV. Child Care Services to be Provided	0	100	
Item:			
9. Daily activity routine	0	100	
10. Food	0	100	
11. Health practices	0	100	
12. Discipline	0	100	
13. Other child care services	0	100	
V. Characteristics of Foster Mother	0	100	
Item:			
14. Description of foster mother; i.e., physical appearance	0	100	

21

SCALE

Various Items of Record Content

to achieve at level of minimal competence; x no basis for judgment.)

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			n=20 % of Trainees			n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
90	10		100	0		55.5	44.4		71.8	28.2	
90	10		100	0		55.5	44.4		71.8	28.2	
60	40		100	0		38.9	61.1		51.3	48.7	
100	0		100	0		61.1	38.9		82.0	17.9	
60	40		33.3	66.7		33.3	66.7		41.0	59.0	
60	40		66.7	33.3		38.9	61.1		53.8	46.2	
20	80		66.7	33.3		16.7	83.3		17.9	82.1	
40	60		66.7	33.3		0	100		15.4	84.6	
50			66.7	33.3		0	100		17.9	82.1	
0	100		0.	100.		0.	100.		0.	100.	
80	20		66.7	33.3		44.4	55.5		46.1	53.8	
10	90		0	100		0	100		2.6	97.4	
50	50		33.3	66.7		27.8	72.2		28.2	71.8	
20	80		66.7	33.3		0	100		10.3	89.7	
0	100		0.	100		0	100		0	100	
10	90		33.3	66.7		0	100		5.1	94.9	
10	90		0	100		11.1	88.9		7.7	82.3	
0	100		0	100		0	100		0	100	
0	100		0	100		0	100		0	100	

TABLE 21--

Category	Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees +	-	x
V. Characteristics of Foster Mother, continued			
Item:			
15. Current functioning	0	100	
16. Significant aspects of past functioning	25	75	
VI. Characteristics of Foster Father	0	100	
Item:			
17. Description of foster father; i.e., physical appearance	0	100	
18. Rule in relation to foster children	25	75	
19. Current functioning		100	
20. Significant aspects of past functioning	37.5	62.5	
VII. Description of Foster Family's Own Children	0	100	
Item:			
21. Outstanding characteristics of own children	50	50	
22. Attitude of own children to foster care plans	0	100	
VIII. Description of Others Living in Household	12.5	12.5	75
Item:			
23. Description in relation to health and personality	12.5	12.5	75
24. Role in household	12.5	12.5	75
25. Role in relation to foster children	12.5	12.5	75
IX. Description of Foster Family as a Whole	0	100	
Item:			
26. Quality of family relationships	0	100	
27. Activities, pleasures, and values held in common	0	100	
28. Ability to share one another and integrate foster children	0	100	
X. Description of Physical Plant	0	100	
Item:			
29. Community and neighborhood	12.5	87.5	
30. Housing	0	100	
31. Indoor activity areas	0	100	
32. Outdoor activity areas	0	100	
33. Sleeping area	0	100	
34. Required inspections	12.5	0	87.5

Continued

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A			State B								
n=10			n=3			n=20			n=41		
% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees			% of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
10	90		0	100		0	100		2.6	97.4	
20	80		0	100		33.3	66.7		25.6	74.4	
10	80	10		100		5.5	88.9	5.5	5.1	89.7	5.1
0	90	10	0	100		0	94.4	5.5	0	94.9	5.1
30	60	10	0	100		38.9	55.5	5.5	30.8	64.1	5.1
20	70	10	0	100		11.1	83.3	5.5	10.3	84.6	5.1
70	20	10	33.3	66.7		44.4	50.0	5.5	48.7	46.1	55.1
30	70		33.3	66.7		16.7	77.8	5.5	17.9	79.5	2.6
60	40		33.3	66.7		50.0	44.4	5.5	51.3	46.1	2.6
10	90		0	100		16.7	77.8	5.5	10.3	87.1	2.6
0	10	90	0	0	100	16.7	5.5	77.8	10.3	7.7	82.0
10		90	0	0	100	16.7	5.5	77.8	12.8	5.1	82.0
0	10	90	0	0	100	16.7	5.5	77.8	10.3	7.7	82.0
0	10	90	0	0	100	11.1	11.1	77.8	7.7	10.3	82.0
0	100		0	100		0	100		0	100	
10	90		0	100		0	100		2.6	97.4	
40	60		0	100		16.7	83.3		17.9	82.0	
0	100		0	100		0	100		0	100	
0	100		0	100		0	100		0	100	
30	70		33.3	66.7		16.7	83.3		20.5	79.5	
30	70		33.3	66.7		0	100		10.3	89.7	
	100		33.3	66.7		0	100		2.6	97.4	
10	90		0	100		0	100		2.6	97.4	
0	100		0	100		5.5	94.4		2.6	97.4	
0	20	80	100	0		11.1	33.3	55.5	15.4	20.5	64.1

Category	Training Method I n=8 % of Trainees +	 -	 x
XI. Material from References	50	50	
Item:			
35. Identification of references	62.5	37.5	
36. Information received	12.5	87.5	
XII. Overall Evaluation and Recommendation	0	100	
Item:			
37. Evaluation in terms of resources to be offered, family, and physical plant	0	100	
38. Recommendation and stipulating conditions	0	100	
39. Understanding of future roles between agency and licensee	12.5	87.5	

Continued

Training Method II						Training Method III			All Trainees		
State A n=10 % of Trainees			State B n=3 % of Trainees			n=20 % of Trainees			n=41 % of Trainees		
+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x	+	-	x
60	40		33.3	66.7		33.3	66.7		43.6	56.4	
60	40		33.3	66.7		44.4	55.5		51.3	48.7	
90	10		33.3	66.7		11.1	88.9		33.3	66.7	
0	100		0	100		0	100		0	100	
10	90		0	100		5.5	94.4		5.1	94.9	
10	90		0	100		27.8	72.2		15.4	84.6	
10	90		0	100		0	100		5.1	94.9	

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 11 1968
on Adult Education